THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

616997

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

2 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1902.

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1902.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_november4-19-1902_114

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. ; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal ; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621 ; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols. ; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols. ; Almon's Debates, 24 vols. ; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols. ; The Hardwicke Papers ; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table :—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41	Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42	Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3	—	1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7	—	1836
— 36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 — 135	17	—	1854
—	136 — 139	18	—	1855
—	140 — 143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21	—	1858
—	152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 — 189	30	—	1867
—	190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870
—	204 — 208	34	—	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 114	2	—	1902

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury and Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council——His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. Chas. T. Ritchie, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Austen Chamberlain, Esq., M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. R. W. Hanbury, M.P.
President of the Board of Education——The Most Noble the Marquess of Londonderry.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——W. Hayes Fisher, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, Bt., M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——Hugh O. Arnold-Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  H. T. Anstruther, Esq., M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Vice-Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Vice-Admiral A. L. Douglas.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Capt. John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Lord Cranborne, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——Lord Stanley, M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.
First Commissioner of Works——Rt. Hon. Lord Windsor.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division.

Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.

Vice Chamberlain——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.

Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.

Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.

Paymaster-General——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.

Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.

Treasurer of the Household——Victor C. W. Cavendish, Esq., M.P.

Master of the Buckhounds——Right Hon. Lord Chesham.

Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. J. B. Balfour.

Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, K.C., M.P.

Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.

Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.

Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.

Solicitor-General——Charles Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl Cadogan, K.G.

Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.

Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.

Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir David Harrel, K.C.B., K.C.V.O.

Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.

Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.

Solicitor-General——Geo. Wright, Esq., K.C.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.

Clerk of Parliaments——Henry J. L. Graham, Esq., C.B.

Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.

Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.

Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.

Chief Clerk and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs——R. W. Monro, Esq.

Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.

Senior Clerks——
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J F. Skene, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; C. L. Anstruther, Esq. (Clerk attending the Table); Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; and A. Tennyson, Esq.

Accountant——G. Fulkes, Esq.

Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court; Assistant Copyist——Mr. H. P. Norris.

Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.

Librarian——S. Arthur Strong, Esq.

Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.

Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.

Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.

Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.

Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.

Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.

Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—(*Cont.*)

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. T. Kendrick.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq ; H. C. Tower, Esq. ; C. V. Frere, Esq. ; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; A. F. B. Williams, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. ; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq. ; C. D. Robertson, Esq. ; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Chaplain to the House——Rev. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Referee of Private Bills——Alfred Bonham Carter, Esq., C.B.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Chief Clerk——H. A. M. Killick, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——Philip Smith, Esq. ; H. Otway Mayne, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——Temple Francks, Esq., B.C.L. ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. Edmund W. Pike ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. W. Harvey.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. J. J. Shelvey, C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman.
Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson, Mr. M. Inglefield.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. Hambling, Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. R. Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram, T. Martin.
Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXIV.

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1902.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 4TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Water Provisional Order Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time tomorrow 1

Osborne Estate Bill.—Ordered, "That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Osborne Estate Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*) 1

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Leek; Whitby; Langholm; Kirkconnel; Thornlie Bank; Haworth; Felling; Rishton, and Pickering; to lie upon the Table 1

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Haslingden; and Orkney; to lie upon the Table 2

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Langholm; Leek; Kirkconnel; Haworth; Felling; Pickering; and Whitby; to lie upon the Table 2

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Worcester; West Ilsley; Wood Green; Southampton; and Warrington; to lie upon the Table 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.—Petition from Dublin, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 2

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Leek, Langholm; Kirkconnel; Haworth; Felling; Rishton; Whitby; and Pickering; to lie upon the table 2

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Manchester; and Park Road; to lie upon the Table 3

Nov. 4.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE UNIONS.—Copy presented, of Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions in 1901, with Comparative Statistics for 1892-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 3

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IMPORTATION OF BASIC SLAG.—Question, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 3

LICENSING ACT, 1902—POLICE ASSISTANCE TO PUBLICANS.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Derbyshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 4

SALE OF OLD BRASS WORK FROM LONDON BRIDGE.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Hunts., Ramsey)... 4

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—ARMOUR PLATE CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 5

IRELAND—DEFAULTING TENANTS ON THE DILLON ESTATE.—Question, Sir John Colomb; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 5

ALL HALLOWS CHURCH, CITY—UNION OF BENEFICES ACT.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Mr. Lees Knowles 5

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—LOANS TO BOERS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 6

ARMOUR FOR NEW CRUISERS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 6

INDIA AND THE GOVERNMENT'S MILITARY PROPOSALS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 7

BRITISH INFLUENCE ON THE YANGTGE VALLEY.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 7

METROPOLITAN POLICE PERJURY.—Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W. R., Holmfirth); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 7

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) ... 8

CANADIAN EXPORTS OF PIG IRON AND STEEL.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour. 8

WORKHOUSE NURSING STAFFS.—Question, Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 9

SCHOOL BUILDING GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 9

Nov. 4.] *Page*

HIGHLAND DEER FORESTS—GLASTULLICH FARM.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 10

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS RETURN.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 11

ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN SCOTTISH WATERS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 11

COLONEL FINCH'S COONAGH PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 12

MAINTENANCE OF THE DEAF AND DUMB IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 12

DUBLIN CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS—BEGGING BY NUNS.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) and Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 13

MONAGHAN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 13

IRISH POLICE AND FREEMASONRY.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 14

IRISH AFFAIRS—NATIONALIST DEMAND FOR A GENERAL DISCUSSION.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 14

LONDON WATER BILL.—Questions, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) and Mr. Lough; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 14

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 10:—

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 15

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'without unnecessary delay.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 16

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 16

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 10, to leave out the words from the word 'not' to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the words from the word 'not' to the first word 'to,' in line 12, stand part of the Clause."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 18
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 20
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 24
Dr. Macnamara 25
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 27
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 27
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 28
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 31

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 203 ; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 468.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word " to," in page 4, line 12, to the word " but," in line 14, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, " That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word " to," to page 4, line 12, to the word " but," in line 14, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 213 ; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 469.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 220 ; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 470.)

Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 43

Amendment proposed—

" In page 4, line 14, after the word 'a' to insert the words 'public elementary.' "—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 43

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 44

Amendment moved—

" In page 4, line 14, to leave out the words 'actually in existence,' in order to insert the words 'existing at the date of the passing of this Act.' "—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, " That the words 'actually in existence' stand part of the Clause."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 46
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 47
Dr. Macnamara 49
Mr. Henry Hobhouse 50
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) 50
Sir William Anson... 51
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 52

Page

Mr. A. J. Balfour 53
Mr. Ernest Gray 53
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) 54
Mr. M'Kenna 54
Mr. A. J. Balfour 54

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment made—

"In page 4, line 14, by leaving out the words, 'actually in existence,' and inserting the words, 'already recognised as a public elementary school.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 55

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 17, to leave out the word 'thirty,' and insert the words 'one hundred.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'thirty' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 56
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 56
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 57
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 57
Mr. Channing 57
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 58

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 230; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 471).

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question, 'That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 243, Noes, 123. (Division List No. 472.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 473.)

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 11:—

Mr. Lough 70
Mr. M'Kenna 71
Sir Robert Finlay 72
Sir William Anson 72

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or fail to provide such additional public school accommodation as is in the opinion of the Board of Education necessary.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Nov .4.] *Page*

Sir William Harcourt 73
Sir Robert Finlay 73
Dr. Macnamara 73
Mr. M'Kenna 74

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'or,' to insert the words, 'if the local education authority or other persons under Section 9.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Sir Robert Finlay 75
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 75
Mr. Lloyd-George 75
Sir John Brunner (*Cheshire, Northwich*) 76

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 116 ; Noes, 243. (Division List No. 474.)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY — MOTION TO SET UP COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER VOTE FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Ritchie, Croydon*) 79

Motion made and proposed, "That this House will tomorrow, at Nine of the clock in the evening, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 84
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 97
Mr. Ritchie 105

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved, "That this House will to-morrow, at Nine of the clock in the evening, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

CIVIL SERVICES, 1902-3 (ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE).—Ordered, That the Additional Estimate, presented 3rd November, be referred to the Committee of Supply.—(*Mr. Hayes, Fisher*) 114

WAYS AND MEANS.—"Resolved, That this House will to-morrow, at Nine of the clock in the evening, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 11 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or fail to provide such additional public school accommodation as is in the opinion of the Board of Education necessary.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put and agreed to.

Question proposed, "That the Clause as amended stand part of the Bill."

Mr. M'Kenna 115
Sir Robert Finlay 116
Sir Charles Dilke 117
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 118
Mr. Lough 118
Mr. Channing 119
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 120

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 200 ; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 475.)

Question put accordingly, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 203 ; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 476.)

Committee report Progress ; to sit again tomorrow.

Bankers' (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*) 127

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

Nov. 5.] *Page*

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 5TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Water Provisional Order Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 129

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Uddingston; Dalziel; Ellesmere Port; Newarthill; Edinburgh; and Markinch; to lie upon the Table... 129

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Norwich; and Newcastle-under-Lyme; to lie upon the Table 129

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Markinch; and Ellesmere Port; to lie upon the Table 129

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Seaforth, in favour; to lie upon the Table 129

FEES FOR BURIAL SERVICES IN PAROCHIAL CEMETERIES.—Petition from Woolwich for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table 129

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Uddingston; Dalziel; Ellesmere Port; Newarthill; and Markinch; to lie upon the Table ... ...

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS ACT, 1888.—Copy presented, of Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents' Rules, 1889 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 365.] 129

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Four Orders in Council, dated 3rd November, 1902, for holding Winter Assizes in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 130

COLONIES.—Copy presented of Circular Despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, relative to the Parliamentary and Municipal and local representation of Trading Companies in the Colonies under responsible Government, and the replies thereto [by command]; to lie upon the Table 130

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2911 and 2912 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 130

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 584 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 130

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DUBLIN SORTING OFFICE—OFFICIALS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain... 130

DUBLIN GENERAL POST OFFICE BUILDINGS—SANITARY CONDITION.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 131

Nov. 5.]

Page

BETTING TELEGRAMS AND TELEGRAPHIC MONEY ORDERS.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 131

TELEGRAPH CLERKS AND BETTING TELEGRAMS.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 132

LEWIS LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 132

GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT WITH CUNARD COMPANY.—WATER-TUBE BOILERS.—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 132

NAVAL DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 133

PHTHISIS IN CORNISH MINES—HOME OFFICE INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 133

SCINDE, PUNJAB, AND DELHI RAILWAY — UNCLAIMED ASSETS.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Mr. Ritchie 134

EDUCATION BILL—STATUS OF ORGANISING TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, Sir William Anson 134

HOME CHARGES ON INDIA.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 134

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION — EXPENSES OF INTERNATIONAL SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 135

TRANSVAAL LIQUOR ORDINANCE.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 136

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA — REPATRIATION OF THE BOERS.—Questions, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield), Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), and Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 137

CIVIL EMPLOYMENT FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS. — Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 138

RATE OF WAGES AT WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 139

VACCINATION—EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 140

LOANS UNDER THE SMALL DWELLINGS ACQUISITION ACT.—Question, Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 140

ROYAL COMMISSION ON ALIEN EMIGRATION.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 140

STORNOWAY MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 141

Nov. 5.] Page

HIGHLAND DEER FORESTS—BEN WYVIS GRAZINGS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire)... ... 142

ISLAND OF LEWIS—LANDLESS COTTARS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 142

SCOTTISH FISHERY BOARD CRUISERS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Graham Murray 143

EDUCATION BILL—SPENDING POWERS OF EDUCATION COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 143

USE OF FOREIGN-MADE PENCILS IN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Questions, Col. Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs) and Sir Howard Vincent; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 143

IRISH BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE—OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES' APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 144

RECRUITING FOR THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 145

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 145

IRISH M.P.'S AND HARD LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 146

BELFAST BOROUGH ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 146

IRISH CENSUS RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 147

ST. MARY'S NATIONAL SCHOOLS, DROGHEDA.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 147

DR. STARKIE AND IRISH PRIMARY SCHOOL MANAGERS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 147

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPORT.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 148

EDUCATION BILL—TRANSFERRED DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.), Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple), and Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 149

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 150

STANDING ORDER 25.—CLOSURE OF DEBATE.—NOTICE OF MOTION. *Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe)* 151

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Tenth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 151

Nov. 5.] Page

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 12:—

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) 151

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out the first two words 'any council' and insert the words 'the local education authority.'"—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any council' stand part of the Clause."

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 152
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 152
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 153
Mr. A. J. Balfour 153
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 153
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 154
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.)... 155
The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 155
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) 158
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 159
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 159
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 160
Mr. Bryce 160
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 161
Sir Charles Dilke 161
Mr. Ernest Gray 161
Dr. Macnamara 162
Mr. A. J. Balfour 162
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorgan, Mid) 163
Sir Robert Finlay 163

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out the words 'in the exercise of,' and insert the word 'having.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'in the exercise of' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Whitley 164

Question put and negatived.

Question, "That the word 'having' be there inserted," put and agreed to.

Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 165

Nov. 5.] Page

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 27, to leave out the word 'shall' in order to insert the word 'may.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson 166
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 167
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 167
Mr. Samuel Evans 168
Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock) 169
Mr. Courteney Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 170
Sir William Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) 170

Question put.

The Committee proceeded to a Division, and the Chairman stated that he thought the Ayes had it; and, on his decision being challenged, it appeared to him that the Division was frivolously claimed, and he accordingly directed the Noes to stand up in their places, and three members having stood up, the Chairman declared that the Ayes had it.

Amendment made—

"In page 4, line 27, by leaving out from the beginning to the word 'an' in line 29, and inserting the word 'establish.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 171

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 29, to leave out the words 'or Education Committees,' and insert the words 'consisting as to a majority of Members of the Council, and as to the remainder.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed—"That the words 'or Education Committees' stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson 173
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 173
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 174
Mr. Yoxall 174
Sir Charles Dilke 175
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire)... 175
Mr. Ernest Gray 176
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 177
Mr. Bond (Nottingham, E.) 178
Mr. A. J. Balfour 178
Mr. M'Kenna 179
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 180
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 181

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) 182

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, after the word 'Committee,' to insert the words 'appointed for a term of three years and.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd Morgan.*)

Page

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson ... 183
Mr. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) ... 184
Mr. Channing ... 184
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 185
Mr. Brigg ... 186
Sir William Anson ... 186
Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) ... 187
Mr. Lloyd George ... 187
Sir William Anson ... 188
Mr. Wharton (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) ... 188
Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield) ... 188
Mr. Abel Thomas (Carmarthenshire, E.) ... 188

Amendment amended—

"By leaving out the word 'of,' and inserting the words 'not exceeding.'"—(*Mr. Abel Thomas.*)

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 118; Noes, 241. (Division List, No. 477.)

Dr. Macnamara ... 191

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 30, after the word 'committees,' to insert the words 'which shall in all cases be subject to the decisions of the local education authority, and shall be.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 193

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Joseph A. Pease ... 193

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, to leave out from the word 'committees,' to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. Joseph A. Pease.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'constituted in accordance with a scheme made by the Council' stand part of the Clause."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 194
Mr. Henry Hobhouse ... 196
Mr. Bryce ... 197
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) ... 199
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) ... 201
Sir Robert Finlay ... 202
Sir John Brunner ... 204
Mr. George Whiteley ... 205

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 241; Noes, 119. (Division List, No. 478).

Sir William Anson 209
Mr. Samuel Evans... 209

The Amendment was agreed to.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means from this Evening's Sitting.

STANDING ORDER 56—PROCEDURE ON SETTING UP SUPPLY FOR "ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES."—On the Order for going into Committee of Supply.
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee)... 210

SUPPLY

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR JEFFREYS (Hants., N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE (1902–3) ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE. (CLASS V.)—£8,000,000 Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 211
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster) 214
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 217
Sir H. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth) 222
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 225
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 225
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) 226
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 229
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 241
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 248

Resolution agreed to; to be reported tomorrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, "That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, the sum of £8,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolution to be reported tomorrow.

Page

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords].—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [21st October] "That the Bill now be read a second time." 252

Question again proposed.

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) 252
Mr. Wyndham 255
Mr. Caldwell 255

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Wednesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 6TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.—Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a letter relating to the imprisonment of a Member 257

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petition from Luton, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table 257

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Steppingley, against; to lie upon the Table 257

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Luton; and Cornwall; to lie upon the Table 257

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Hindley; Liverpool; and Southampton; to lie upon the Table 257

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition from Luton for legislation; to lie upon the Table 257

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1859.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 1st November, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Professor of Agriculture in the Royal College of Science, Dublin, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 258

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 371 (St. Helena, Annual Report for 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 258

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Return for the quarter ended 30th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 258

ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1902-3 (SOUTH AFRICAN WAR).—Copy presented, of Statement showing approximately the revised amounts now required under the various Votes for Army Expenditure in view of the conclusion of peace in South Africa, as compared with the provision made in the Estimates submitted to Parliament, with explanations of the differences [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 258

Nov. 6.] *Page*

Civil Servants.—Return ordered, "showing the total number of persons in the established Civil Service of the State on the 31st day of March, 1902, distinguishing those in each department of the Civil Service and Revenue Departments respectively."—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*) 258

London Water Area.—Return ordered, "of Statement showing the population and rateable (and assessable) values of the boroughs and urban districts to be represented on the Water Board; together with the same particulars relating to the boroughs, urban districts, and rural districts (or the parts thereof) within the Metropolitan Water Area which are either to be excluded from that Area or to be unrepresented on the Water Board; also the proportion which the population and the rateable value of each district bears to the total population, and the total rateable value respectively of the whole of the proposed Water Area."—(*Mr. Rea.*) 258

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Trade Statistics.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 259

Island of Lewis.—Building Regulations.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Graham Murray 259

Edgeworthstown Postmaster.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 259

Newbridge Postmaster.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 260

Dublin Sorting Office Staff.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 260

Salisbury Post Office Officials.—Question, Mr. Goddard (Ipswich); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 260

Poor Law Village Communities.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 261

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation.—Question, Mr. Morrell (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 262

Navy—Firing Matches.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 262

India—Gold Remmittances, Currency Reserves, etc.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Lord George Hamilton... 262

Army Officers—Pay as Interpreters.—Question, Mr. Halsey (Hertfordshire, Watford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 264

Officers' Liability for Barrack Furniture.—Question, Mr. Halsey; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 264

South African War—Ranking of Volunteer Officers.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 264

War Office Works Department Committee.—Question, Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 265

South Africa—Government Loans to Boers.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 265

Nov. 6.] *Page*

EDUCATION BILL—SCHOOL TEACHERS AND MEMBERSHIP OF MUNICIPAL BODIES.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Sir William Anson 266

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—JOHANNESBURG LOCAL RATES.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 266

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 267

ARMY COMMISSIONS.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 267

ARMY OFFICERS' PAY.—Question, Lieut.-Col. Tufnell (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 268

TRAINING OF RECRUITS—BARRACK ACCOMMODATION AT OMAGH.—Questions, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.) and Mr. Archdale (Fermanagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 268

ARMY RE-ENLISTMENTS—AGE REGULATIONS.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 269

EMPLOYMENT OF RESERVISTS IN CIVILIAN DUTIES.—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 269

NAVAL GUNNERY—PRACTICE AMMUNITION.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 269

BOYS AND ABLE SEAMEN IN THE CHANNEL FLEET.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 270

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) ... 270

ONTARIO BOUNTIES ON BEET SUGAR EXPORTS.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central), 271

MACEDONIAN REFORMS.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Lord Cranborne... 271

LOSSES THROUGH FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.—Question, Mr. Archdale; Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 272

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTAL POWERS TO COUNTY COUNCILS.—Question, Mr. Pym (Bedford); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 272

POST-OFFICE AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 273

LURGAN POST-OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 273

Nov. 6] Page

COMPENSATION FOR MALICIOUS DAMAGE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover)... ... 274

BALLAGHADEREEN PUBLICAN'S LICENCE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 274

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Archdale; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 275

IRISH DISPENSARY MEDICAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 275

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD—SALE OF LORD DILLON'S MANSION.—Questions, Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 276

CALDERWOOD V. M'CURDY.—Questions, Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 276

IRISH POOR LAW SUPERANNUATION.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 277

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 277

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words '(2) All matters relating to the exercise by the Council of their powers under this Act shall stand referred to the Education Committee, and the Council, before exercising such powers, shall consider the report (if any) of the Education Committee with respect to the matter in question. The Council may also delegate to the Education Committee, with or without any restrictions or conditions, as they think fit, any of their powers under this Act, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade)... 279
Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 281

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment as amended—

"After the word 'Act' to insert the words 'except power of raising a rate or borrowing money.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

The Prime Minister, and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 281
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 281

Page
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 281
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 282
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 283
Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield) 283
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 284
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 284
Mr. M'Kenna 284

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Brynmor Jones 284

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'shall stand' in order to insert the words 'may be.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'shall stand' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir William Anson 285
Sir William Harcourt 285
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 286
Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye) 286
Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) 287
Sir Robert Finlay 287
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 288

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, as amended—

"To leave out the word 'stand,' and insert the word 'be.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'stand' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir John Brunner 290
Mr. Bryce 290
Sir James Woodhouse 290
Sir William Harcourt 292
Mr. Whitley 292
Mr. A. J. Balfour 293
Mr. Joseph A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 293
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) 294

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 100. (Division List, No. 479.)

Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 297

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, after the word 'committee' to insert the words 'who shall consider the same forthwith and report thereon with despatch to the council.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Nov. 6.]

Page

Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) ... 297
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 298
Mr. Bryce ... 298
Sir Robert Finlay ... 299
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 299

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) ... 300

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out from the word 'and' down to the word 'the' in line 4."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) ... 301
Sir William Anson ... 301
Sir John Dorington ... 302
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 302

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, to leave out the words 'if any.'"—(*Sir Robert Finlay.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Words [of Sir William Anson's original Amendment, as amended] inserted.

Mr. Lloyd-George ... 304

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 33, to leave out sub-Section (*a*), and insert, (*a*), 'That a majority of the committee shall be members of the Council.'" —(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (*a*) stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson ... 304
Sir William Harcourt ... 305
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) ... 305
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) ... 306

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 34, after the word 'Committee,' to insert the words 'who shall also be members of the Council unless the Council shall otherwise determine.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Colonel Robert Williams (*Dorsetshire W.*)... 308
Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) ... 309
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) ... 309
Mr. Heywood Johnstone (*Sussex, Horsham*) ... 309

Mr. Bryce 310
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 310
Mr. M'Kenna 311
Mr. Bond (Nottingham, E.) 311
Mr. Channing 312
Sir James Woodhouse 314
Sir Charles Dilke 314

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'members of the Council,' and insert the word 'councillors.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'members of the Council' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour... 314
Mr. Samuel Evans 315

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes. 232; Noes, 122. (Division List, No. 480.)

Mr. Ellis Griffith 317

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'unless the Council shall otherwise determine.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour... 319
Sir William Harcourt 321
Mr Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 321
Capt. Balfour (Middlesex, Hornsey) 322
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 323
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 326
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 326
Mr. Lloyd-George 326
Mr. M'Kenna 326
Mr. Samuel Evans 326
Sir John Brunner 328
Sir Robert Finlay 328

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 125. (Division List, No. 481.)

Words inserted.

Mr. Humphreys-Owen ... ...

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 35, to leave out sub-Section (*b*)."—(*Mr Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'for the' stand part of the Clause."

Nov. 6.] *Page*

Sir Robert Finlay 333
Mr. Herbert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 334
Sir John Brunner 335
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*) 335
Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*)... 337

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY—REPORT—(5th November.)

Resolution reported:—

CIVIL SERVICE (1902–3) ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE—CLASS V.

"That a sum not exceeding £8,000,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, for a Grant in Aid to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, for expenses consequent upon the termination of the War."

Mr. Edmuud Robertson (*Dundee*)... 338
Mr. Lough (*Islington W.*)... 340
The Chancellor of the Exchequeur (*Mr. Ritchie, Croydon*) 340
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 344
Mr. Kemp (*Lancashire, Heywood*) 345
The Master of Elibank (*Edinburgh, Mid Lothian*) 346
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 347
Mr. Alfred Davies (*Carmarthen Boroughs*) 348

Resolution agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT—(5th November.)

Resolution reported:—

"That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, the sum of £8,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.—"To supply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, and to appropriate the further Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time tomorrow 349

Nov. 6.]

Page

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 12 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 35, to leave out sub-section (*b*)."—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*")

Question again proposed, "That the words 'for the' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Moss (*Denbighshire, E.*) ... 349
Sir William Anson ... 350
Sir William Harcourt ... 353
Mr. Walter Palmer (*Salisbury*) ... 355
Mr. Ellis Griffith ... 356
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*)... 357
Mr. Bryn Roberts ... 358

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn—

Sir James Woodhouse ... 359

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 35, after the first word 'the to insert the words 'selection and.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson ... 359
Mr. Bryce.... ... 360
Sir William Anson ... 361
Mr. Ernest Gray ... 361
Mr. Lloyd George ... 363
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) ... 366
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 368
Mr. Robson... ... 368
Sir Francis Powell... ... 369
Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) ... 370
Mr. Brigg (*Yorkshire, W. R. Keighley*) ... 371

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 92 ; Noes, 194. (Division List, No. 482.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the first word "of," inclusive, in page 4, line 36, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the first word "of," inclusive, in page 4, line 36, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 188 ; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 483.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 190; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 484.)

It being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again tomorrow.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time tomorrow 379

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords].—Considered in Committee, and reported, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered tomorrow 380

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, 7TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, "That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next."—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) ... 381

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Herbert Lewis Samuel, esquire, for North Riding of Yorkshire (Cleveland Division) 381

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petition from Wednesbury, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table... 381

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 381

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Wednesbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 381

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Enfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 381

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition from Wednesbury, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 381

SITE VALUES (INSANITARY AREAS).—Petition from St. Pancras, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 381

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION.—Return [presented 31st October] to be printed. [No. 367.] 381

FISHING PIERS (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July; *Sir Thomas Esmonde*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 368.] 381

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ROYAL PARKS—CONCESSIONS TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES—BUSHEY PARK.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes... 382

INDIA—CULTIVATED AND WASTE LAND STATISTICS, 1880-1902.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 383

RUPEE COINAGE—GOLD RESERVE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 383

INDIAN CURRENCY—CLOSING OF MINTS IN NATIVE STATES.—Question, Sir John Rolleston (Leicester); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 383

EXPENSES OF INDIAN GUESTS—TROOPS AT THE CORONATION.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 383

INDIAN BUDGET—NOTATION EMPLOYED IN EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUMS.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 384

LONDON WATER BILL—REMUNERATION TO PROPOSED COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Walter Long ... 385

ARMY—AVERAGE ANNUAL COST OF VARIOUS ARMS.—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 385

SOUTH AFRICA—WAR LOSSES LOAN—DISTRIBUTION.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 386

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 387

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'Rural District Councils.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 387
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 388
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.)... 388
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 388
Mr. Heywood Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham) 389
Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock) 390

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 74; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 485.)

Nov. 7.]

Page
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 391

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, to leave out the words 'other bodies,' and insert the words 'educational institutions in or near the district not themselves subject to the control of the local education authority, such as universities, colleges of university rank, non-local schools and local endowed schools.'"—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'other' stand part of the Clause."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 393
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 393
Mr. A. J. Balfour 395
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 396
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 397
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 397
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 398
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 399
Mr. Bond (*Nottingham, E.*) 401
Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 402
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 403
Mr. James Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 405
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 406

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 158; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 486.)

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'other' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 487.)

Sir ROBERT FINLAY rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "acts," inclusive, in page 4, line 39, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "acts," inclusive, in page 4, line 39, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 157; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 488.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 169; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 489.)

Mr. Brynmor Jones (*Swansea District*) 415

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, after the word 'acts' to insert the words, 'provided that two-thirds of the persons appointed by the Council shall be resident ratepayers in such area.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Nov. 7.]

Page

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 417
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 417
Mr. Lloyd-George 418
Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton) 419
Mr. Samuel Evans 419
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 420

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 92 ; Noes, 170. (Division List No. 490.)

Mr. Henry Hobhouse 423

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, at end to insert '(*c*) For the inclusion of women as well as men among the members of the committee."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Bryce 425
Mr. A. J. Balfour... 427
Sir Charles Dilke 428
Sir Robert Finlay 429
Mr. Samuel Evans 430
Mr. Bartley 431
Sir William Anson 431
Mr. Ernest Gray 431
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 432

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon) 433

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, at the end, to insert the following words: 'Provided that a person shall be disqualified for being a member of an Education Committee, who, by reason of holding an office or place of profit, or having any share or interest in a contract, or employment, is disqualified for being a member of the council appointing the Education Committee. But no such disqualification shall apply to a person by reason only of his holding office in a school or college aided, but not provided or maintained, by the Council.' "—(*Mr. A. K. Loyd.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 433
Mr. Bryce 434
Mr. Lloyd-George 434
Mr. A. K. Loyd 434
Mr. Lloyd-George 434

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 6, to omit 'but not.' "—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'but not' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 435
Mr. A. J. Balfour 435
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 435
Sir Francis Powell 436
Mr. Emmott 436
Mr. Ernest Gray 436
Sir John Brunner 437
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) 437
Mr. A. J. Balfour 438

Amendment to proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Plummer (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 438

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words '(*e*) For the appointment (if desirable) of members of School Boards existing at the time of the passing of this Act as members of the first committee.' "—(*Mr. Plummer.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 440
Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) 440

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'if desirable.' "—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 185; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 491.)

Words inserted.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "made," inclusive, in page 5, line 15, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "made," inclusive, in page 5, in line 15, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 179; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 492.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 177; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 493.)

It being after half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

NOTICE TO EXPEDITE DEBATE.
Mr. A. J. Balfour 447

Nov. 10.] *Page*

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords] as amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 448

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 10th NOVEMBER, 1902.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, Etc.) Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered and agreed to 449

Water Provisional Order Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 185.) 449

PETITIONS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz:—

Army (Pay, Non-Effective Pay, and Allowances).—List of exceptions to the Army regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1902. (November 4.) 449

Trade Reports.

I. Annual Series:—

No. 2911. Russia (Riga, etc.). (November 5.)
No. 2912. China. (November 5.)

II. Miscellaneous Series:—

No. 584. United States—Agriculture of the State of Maine. (November 5.) 449

Colonies.

I. (General)—Parliamentary and municipal and local representation of trading companies in the Colonies under responsible government. Circular despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, and the replies thereto. (November 5.)

II. (Annual)—No. 371, St. Helena—Report for 1901. (November 7.) 449

Local Records Committee.

I. Report of the Committee appointed to inquire as to the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of local records, and as to further measures which it may be advisable to take for the purpose. (November 6.)

II. Appendices. (November 6.)... 449

Land Law (Ireland) (Agrarian Outrages).—Return for the quarter ended 30th September, 1902. (November 7.) 450

War in South Africa (Army Expenditure, 1902-1903).—Statement showing approximately the revised amounts now required under the various Votes in view of the conclusion of peace as compared with the provision made in the estimates submitted to Parliament; with explanations of the difference. (November 7.)

The same were ordered to lie upon the Table 450

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).—Four Orders in Council, dated 3rd November, 1902, for holding winter assizes in Ireland 450

SUPERANNUATION (PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS).—Treasury Minute, dated 1st November, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Professor of Agriculture in the Royal College of Science, Dublin, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 450

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till Tomorrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 10th NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The CLERK at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 450

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Osborne Estate Bill (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 4th day of November, That, in the case of the following Bill, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz:—Osborne Estate Bill 451

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table 451

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Cornwall, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 451

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the city of Wakefield, the borough of Ossett, and in the townships of Horbury, Lofthouse-with-Carlton, Thorpe, Rothwell, Sandal Magna, Oulton-with-Woodlesford, and in the parishes of Rothwell, East Ardsley, and Outwood in the West Riding of the county of York (Wakefield and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table... 451

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the South Norfolk Light Railway Order, 1898 (South Norfolk Light Railway (Extension of time) Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 451

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Crowland and District Light Railways Order, 1898 (Crowland and District Light Railways (Amendment) Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 452

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the Borough of Morley and the urban districts of Birkenshaw, Drighlington, and Gomersal, in the West Riding of the county of York, and for other purposes (Spen Valley and Morley Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 452

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the County of Southampton, from Bentley to Bordon (Bentley and Borden Light Railway Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 452

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EDUCATION BILL—POSITION OF NON-AIDED CHURCH SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Morrell (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 452

CONSULAR SERVICE COMMITTEE.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Lord Cranborne 452

HOWDEN CLEUGH POSTMASTER.—Question, Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 453

"THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES"—NEW CONTRACT.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Hayes-Fisher 453

EDUCATION BILL—GROUND RENT CHARGE ON SCHOOL BUILDINGS.—Question, Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham); Answer, Sir William Anson 454

EDUCATION BILL—DEFINITION OF "OTHER BODIES."—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 454

CENSUS RETURNS—POPULATION OF CARMARTHEN.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 454

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD INSPECTORS AND AUDITORS.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 455

ATHLONE POLICE — COST OF MEDICAL ATTENDANCE ON POLICE FEVER PATIENTS.—Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 455

ARMY SPECIAL SANITARY OFFICERS.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 455

2ND KENT GARRISON ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS — ARMAMENT. — Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 456

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 456

WOOLWICH ROYAL ARSENAL PAYMASTER AND COLLECTOR OF INCOME TAX.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 457

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 457

Nov. 10.] *Page*

SOMALILAND OPERATIONS — GERMAN TRANSPORT FOR BRITISH TROOPS.—Questions, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 457

INDIA — DISABILITIES OF "PURDANISHINS." — Question, Mr. Arthur Elliot (Durham); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 458

INDIAN INTERESTS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton ... 459

LEWES GUY FAWKES CELEBRATION.—Questions, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 459

SOUTH AFRICAN SHIPPING COMBINE.—Questions, Mr. Bell (Derby), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs), Sir William Allan (Gateshead), and Mr. Tully; Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 459

BUTTERINE BILL.—Questions, Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire) and Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answers, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 461

CANADIAN CATTLE—RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION.—Question, Sir John Leng Dundee; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 461

FOREIGN-MADE PENCILS IN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 462

WAGES OF BELFAST POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 462

IRISH AND WELSH LANGUAGES IN THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 462

THE HILL OF TARA.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 463

MIDDLETON GUARDIANS—USE OF BOARD ROOM.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 463

BELFAST INFIRMARY—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 463

MARINE WORKS (IRELAND) ACT.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 464

"FUTURE" TENANTS IN COUNTY LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 464

IRISH CLERKS OF UNIONS—FRANCHISE AND JURORS ROLLS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 465

EXPLOSIVES BYE-LAWS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 466

HATLEY BRIDGE ACROSS THE SHANNON.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 466

BRITISH ORDERS AND DECORATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 466

THE PERMANENT SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 467

THE BRUSSELS CONVENTION.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Dalziel, and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 468

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—INDIAN BUDGET DEBATE.—Questions, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.), Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee), Mr. Dalziel, and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 469

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Order for Committee read.

The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 470

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 491
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Derbyshire, W.) 501
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 507

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the cost of the Parliamentary representatives of the India Office, with an adequate staff, should be paid by the United Kingdom by a Vote of Parliament."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.) 513
Lord George Hamilton 515

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 119; Noes, 45. (Division List No. 494.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne) 521
The Under Secretary of State for India (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) ... 538

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [this day], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Question again proposed.

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.) 549
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 557
Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter) 565

Lord George Hamilton 569
Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.) 572
Mr. Wylie (Dumbartonshire) 573

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Wylie.*)

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 575
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 575
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 576
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes-Fisher, Fulham) ... 577

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for tomorrow.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 578
Mr. Dalziel 579

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 579
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 581
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) 583

Question put and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

Osborne Estate Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell 583

It being after midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Food and Drugs Acts Amendment Bill.—Order for Committee read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 11TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 585

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Galashiels (two); Selkirk; Biggleswade; Arlesey; Dover; Armadale; and, Bo'ness; to lie upon the Table 585

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Millbrook; Ampthill; Morse; and, Week St. Mary; to lie upon the Table 585

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Biggleswade; Arlesey; Dover; Armadale; and, Bo'ness; to lie upon the Table 585

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Great Shefford; Southport; and, Birkdale; to lie upon the Table 585

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Selkirk; Biggleswade; Arlesey; Armadale; and, Bo'ness; to lie upon the Table ... 585

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th August; *Mr. Walter Palmer*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 369]... 585

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Return of the number of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 585

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CAPE GUARDAFUI LIGHTHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Cranborne 586

ZANZIBAR—CASE OF SLAVE GIRL MSICHOKE.—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Lord Cranborne 586

COLONIAL PATENT LAWS.—Question, Mr. Rigg (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 586

REMOUNT OFFICERS—STATUS OF VETERINARY OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Rigg; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 587

EDUCATION BILL—ALLOCATION OF UNDENOMINATIONAL ENDOWMENTS.—Question, Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 587

EDUCATION BILL—GOVERNMENT AMENDMENTS.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 587

LONDON WATER BILL.—Question, Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 588

Nov. 11.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE MEDITERRANEAN FLEET.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 588

ROYAL NAVY—PENSIONS OF CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 589

MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S TOUR—THE "GOOD HOPE."—Questions, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton), and Sir William Allen (Gateshead); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 589

SALE OF ARMY HORSES IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. Lambert; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 590

SOUTH AFRICA REPATRIATION BOARDS—PURCHASERS FROM THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Lord Stanley. 591

RESERVISTS PAY ARREARS.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answers, Lord Stanley 591

ARMY STAFF APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 592

ARMY MOBILISATION.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Lord Stanley 592

BRITISH RESIDENTS AT JERUSALEM.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottinghamshire, W.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 593

UGANDA RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Lord Cranborne 594

SUPPLY OF ARMY HORSES.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 594

ISLAND OF LEWIS—HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 594

ISLAND OF LEWIS FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 595

VOLUNTEERS AND RICHMOND PARK.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 595

PALACE YARD LIGHTING ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 596

IRELAND—NORTH-WEST ASSIZE CIRCUIT.—Question, The Marquess of Hamilton (Londonderry); Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 596

LOUGH GARA EEL FISHERY.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 597

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) ACTS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 598

EXAMINATIONS FOR IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDITORS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 598

GARRICK-ON-SHANNON GOAL.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 599

LONGFORD AND LEITRIM FAIR RENT APPLICATIONS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 599

IRISH DISPENSARY MEDICAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 599

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) ACT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 600

THE BRUSSELS CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 600

LONDON STREET TRAFFIC—PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), and Mr. T. M. Healey (Louth, N.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 601

THE CUNARD AGREEMENT.—Questions, Mr. Alexander Cross, and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 601

THE INDIAN BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 602

TUNBRIDGE WELLS TELEPHONE SYSTEM.—Questions, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 602

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Dalziel; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 603

A QUESTION OF ORDER.—Question, Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Ruling, Mr. Speaker 604

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Austin Taylor, esquire, for the Borough of Liverpool (East Toxteth Division).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the consideration of business relating to the Education (England and Wales) Bill (Procedure) if under discussion at twelve o'clock this night be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided. Ayes, 268; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 495.)

Education (England and Wales) Bill (PROCEDURE).

The Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 607

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill (including Proceedings on the Financial Resolution relating thereto), shall, unless previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion at times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned:—

"(*a*) The Proceedings in Committee on the remaining part of Clause 12, and on Clause 13, on Wednesday, 12th November; (*b*) The Proceedings on Clauses 14, 15, 16 and 17, on Thursday, 13th November; (*c*) The Proceedings on Clauses 18, 19 and 20, and on the Committee Stage of the Financial Resolution, on Friday, 14th November ; (*d*) The Proceedings on Report of the Financial Resolution, and on the New Clause relating to the aid grant, on Monday, 17th November ; (*e*) The Proceedings on the new Clauses relating to endowment, local authority's managers, and grouping, on Tuesday, 18th November ; (*f*) The Proceedings on the New Clause relating to managers, and any other Government New Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other Proceedings necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion, on Thursday, 20th November ; (*g*) The consideration of the Report shall be appointed for Tuesday, 25th November ; and the Proceedings on Report or on any New Clauses and on Amendments to Parts I. and II. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on that day ; (*h*) The Proceedings on Report on Amendments to Part III. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on Thursday, 27th November ; (*i*) The Proceedings on the Report of the Bill shall be concluded on Friday, 28th November.

"At 11 p.m. on the said days, or, if the day is a Friday, at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business.

"In the case of New Clauses and Schedules, he shall put only the Question that such Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill.

"Proceedings under this Order shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

"After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Education (England and Wales) Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no Dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order 17, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith.

"If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 621

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That,' in line 1, and to add the words, 'this House declines to entertain a proposal to restrict debate upon a measure which, since it vitally affects the whole working of local government and administration, and, while assuming to establish a permanent system of national education, endows denominational teaching out of the rates without securing full popular control, demands the most searching examination in every particular.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words to the end of line 6 stand part of the Question."

Page
Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 631
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 640
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick) 644
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 648
Mr. Elliot (Durham) 651
Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 654
Mr. Wanklyn (Bradford, Central) 658
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 660
Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 667
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 668
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 669
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) 670
Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe)... 672
Mr. Priestley (Grantham) 675

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [this day], "That the Proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill (including proceedings on the Financial Resolution relating thereto), shall, unless previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion at the times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned:

(*a*) The Proceedings in Committee on the remaining part of Clause 12, and on Clause 13, on Wednesday, 12th November; (*b*) The Proceedings on Clauses 14, 15, 16, and 17, on Thursday, 13th November; (*c*) The Proceedings on Clauses 18, 19, and 20, and on the Committee Stage of the Financial Resolution, on Friday, 14th November; (*d*) The Proceedings on Report of the Financial Resolution, and on the New Clause relating to the aid grant, on Monday, 17th November; (*e*) The Proceedings on the New Clauses relating to endowments, local authority's managers, and grouping, on Tuesday, 18th November; (*f*) The Proceedings on the New Clause relating to managers, and any other Government New Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other Proceedings necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion, on Thursday, 20th November; (*g*) The Consideration of the Report shall be appointed for Tuesday, 25th November; and the Proceedings on Report on any New Clauses and on Amendments to Parts I. and II. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on that day; (*h*) The Proceedings on Report on Amendments to Part III. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on Thursday, 27th November; (*i*) The Proceedings on the Report of the Bill shall be concluded on Friday, 28th November.

"At 11 P.M. on the said days, or, if the day is a Friday, at 4.30 P.M., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business.

Nov. 11.] *Page*

"In the case of new Clauses and Schedules, he shall put only the Question that such Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill.

"Proceedings under this Order shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 P.M.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

"After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Education (England and Wales) Bill stands as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order 17, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith.

"If Progress be reported the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent Sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'this House declines to entertain a proposal to restrict debate upon a measure which, since it vitally affects the whole working of local government and administration, and, while assuming to establish a permanent system of national education, endows denominational teaching out of the rates without securing full popular control, demands the most searching examination in every particular.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words to the end of line 6 stand part of the Question."

Mr. Priestley 677
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 679
Sir William Holland (*Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham*) 681
Mr. Cohen (*Islington, N.*) 683
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 685
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.*) 691
Mr. Asquith (*Fife, E.*) 708

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 284; Noes, 152. (Division List No. 496.)

Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 721

Amendment proposed to the Question—

"To leave out the words in line 7, and insert the words 'on Wednesday, the 12th November, and on Clause 13 on Thursday the 13th November.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Chaplin 723
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 723
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 723
Mr. A. J. Balfour 724

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

An Amendment made—

"By leaving out from the word 'on,' in line 7, to the word 'Clauses,' in line 8, and by inserting, after the word 'Clauses,' the word '13.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) 725

Amendment proposed—

"In line 19, to leave out the words 'Thursday, 20th,' and insert the words 'Monday, 24th.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 726
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 726
Mr. A. J. Balfour 728

Question put.

The House Divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 497.)

Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) 731

Amendment proposed—

"In line 23, to leave out the words 'that day' and insert the words, 'Friday, 28th November.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour... 733

Question put and agreed to.

Question put, "That the Proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill (including Proceedings on the Financial Resolution relating thereto), shall unless previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion at the times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned:—

"(*a*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining part of Clause 12, and on Clauses 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, on Thursday, 13th November; (*b*) The proceedings on Clauses 18, 19, and 20, and on the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution, on Friday, 14th November; (*c*) The proceedings on Report of the Financial Resolution, and on the new Clause relating to the aid grant, on Monday 17th November; (*d*) The proceedings on the New Clauses relating to endowments, local authority's managers, and grouping, on Tuesday 18th November; (*e*) The proceedings on the new Clause relating to managers, and any other Government new Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, on Thursday 20th November; (*f*) The consideration of the Report shall be appointed for Tuesday 25th November; and the proceedings on Report on any new Clauses and on Amendments to Parts I. and II. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on that day; (*g*) The proceedings on Report on Amendments to Part III. of the Bill shall be brought

Nov. 12.] Page

to a conclusion on Thursday 27th November; (*h*) The proceedings on the Report of the Bill shall be concluded on Friday 28th November. At 11 P.M. on the said days, or, if the day is a Friday, at 4.30 P.M. the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith a Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business. In the case of new Clauses and Schedules, he shall put only the Question that such Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill. Proceedings under this Order shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 P.M.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House. After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Education (England and Wales) Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order 17, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 498.)

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 12TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Stafford; New Brancepeth; and Pittington; to lie upon the Table ... 741

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Falkirk; Bradford; Duns; and South Shields; to lie upon the Table 471

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Stafford; Pittington; New Brancepeth; and Durham (two); to lie upon the Table 741

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Scottish Trade Protection Society, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 741

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Stafford; New Brancepeth; and Pittington; to lie upon the Table 741

REGISTRATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES BILL.—Petition from Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 741

TRADE MARKS BILL.—Petition from Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table 741

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NAVY—ACCIDENTS WHEN FIRING SALUTES.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 741

POSITION OF SEAMEN PENSIONERS RE-ENGAGED.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 742

POSTAL ORDERS—OFFICE OF PAYMENT.—Question, Sir James Haslett (Belfast, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 743

AMERICAN LOCOMOTIVES ON UGANDA RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 743

LOANS UNDER THE SMALL DWELLINGS ACQUISITION ACT.—Question, Mr. M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 743

ALLEGED GRIEVANCES OF CUSTOMS BOATMEN.—Question, Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 744

WAR OFFICE—CLERICAL EMPLOYMENT OF EX-SOLDIERS.—Question, Col. Brookfield (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 744

MILITIA—STRENGTH AND RECRUITING STATISTICS.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 745

VOLUNTEER ESTABLISHMENT STATISTICS.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 745

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—COMMISSIONS FOR VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick (Surrey, Guildford) 746

NEW GARRISON REGIMENTS.—Question, Mr. Beckett (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 746

RAILWAY BRAKES.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 747

RAILWAY SERVANTS' HOURS OF LABOUR—L. C. AND D. RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr Gerald Balfour 747

RAILWAY CROSSING FATALITY AT THAMES IRONWORKS.—Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 747

ROADS IN MID-ROSS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord-Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire)... 747

ISLAND OF LEWIS HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 747

APPLECROSS (ROSS) ROAD AND BRIDGE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 749

ISLAND OF LEWIS FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 750

TYPHUS FEVER AT NESS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 750

Nov. 12.] *Page*

SCOTTISH FISHERY BOARD—MR. MCILOY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 751

IRELAND—LABOURERS' COTTAGES AT ROSCREA.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 751

MUTOSCOPES AT LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 752

DR. STARKIE AND IRISH PRIMARY SCHOOL MANAGERS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 752

TRADE OF THE PORT OF LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 752

ILLEGAL FISHING IN DUBLIN BAY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 753

SLIGO AND THE CANADIAN MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 753

RESIGNATION OF SIR DAVID HARREL—THE NEW UNDER SECRETARY—GOVERNMENT LAND PURCHASE POLICY.—Questions, Mr. Tully and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham and The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 753

PROSECUTIONS OF LADIES UNDER THE CRIMES ACT.—Questions, Mr. Tully and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 754

CARLOW—PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE SANITARY LAWS.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 755

LONDONDERRY POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Questions, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 755

POST OFFICE AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain) 756

NEWRY RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 757

WRECKAGE OFF THE DONEGAL COAST.—Questions, Mr. O'Doherty and Mr. T. M. Healy; Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 757

ARMAGH INCOME TAX APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham)... 758

LONDONDERRY SHIPBUILDING YARDS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 759

PORT ERLIN (LOUGH SWILLY) BOAT SLIP.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 759

LONDON STREET TRAFFIC—PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION.—Question, Sir J. Dickson Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 759

Page

NEW BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND).

The Lord Advocate (*Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire*) 760

Bill to ammend the borrowing provisions of the Electric Lighting Act, 1882, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—"To amend the borrowing provisions of The Electric Lighting Act, 1882, and The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301].

IRISH VALUATION ACTS.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed].

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 370.] 760

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].—Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of certain Annual Grants to Local Education Authorities in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to make further provision with respect to Education in England and Wales (King's recommendation signified), tomorrow.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) 761

Education (England and Wales) Bill

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

Mr. Luke White (*Yorkshire, E. R., Buckrose*) 761

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 15, at the end, to insert the words '(6) The meetings and proceedings of any Education Committee constituted under this section shall be subject in all respects to the same provisions and regulations as those which now affect any ordinary or joint committees of any Council.'"—(*Mr. Luke White.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 762
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*)... 762
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 762
Mr. A. J. Balfour... 762
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid*) 763

Amendment amended—

"By leaving out the words, 'or joint.'"—(*Mr. Luke White.*)

Nov. 12.] *Page*

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 95; Noes, 150. (Division List, No. 499.)

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 5, line 16, to leave out sub-Section (6), and insert: (6) 'Any scheme for establishing an education committee of the council of any county or county borough in Wales or of the county of Monmouth or county borough of Newport, shall provide that the county governing body constituted under The Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, for any such county or county borough shall cease to exist, and shall make such provision as appears necessary or expedient for the transfer of the powers, duties, property, and liabilities of any such body to the local education authority under this Act, and for making the provisions of this section applicable to the exercise by the local education authority of the powers so transferred.'"—(*Sir Alfred Thomas.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (6) stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 766
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) 767
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 769
Mr. Kenyon (Denbigh) 771
Mr. Moss (Denbighshire, E.) 771
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 772

Question put, and negatived.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put and agreed to.

Question proposed, "That Clause 12 as amended stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Whitley 774
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 775
Mr. A. J. Balfour 778
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 780
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 783
Mr. Samuel Evans 783
Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) 785
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 785
Sir William Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) 786
Mr. Lloyd-George 787
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 789
The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 790
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 791
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 792

Question put, "That Clause 12 as amended stand part of the Bill."

Committee divided :—Ayes, 259; Noes, 138. (Division List No. 500.)

Clause 13 :—

Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 795

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 5, line 21, to leave out the words 'expenses of a Council under this Act,' and insert the words 'expenditure out of rates under this Act shall in no case exceed one-fourth of the whole expenditure on education by the education authority, and the expenses of that authority.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Page

Question proposed, "That the words 'expenses of a Council' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 801
Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 803
Mr. James Lowther (*Kent, Thanet*) 805
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 806
Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 809
Mr. Philipps (*Pembrokeshire*) 812
Mr. David McIver (*Liverpool, Kirkdale*) 813
Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) 814

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 13:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the words 'expenses of a Council under this Act,' and insert the words 'expenditure out of rates under this Act shall in no case exceed one-fourth of the whole expenditure on education by the education authority, and the expenses of that authority.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'expenses of a Council' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Soares 815
Mr. Duke (*Plymouth*) 817
Mr. Alfred Davies (*Carmarthen Borough*) 819
Mr. Heywood Johnstone (*Sussex, Horsham*) 820
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N. W.*) 821
Sir W. Hart Dyke (*Kent, Dartford*) 823
Mr. George Whiteley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey*) 825
Major Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) 826
Mr. A. J. Balfour 829
Mr. Chaplin 829
Mr. A. J. Balfour 830

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 291; Noes, 14. (Division List No. 501.)

Mr. Soares 833

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, after the word 'Council,' to insert the words 'including the reasonable travelling expenses of the members of the education committee.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Nov. 12.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Bryce ... 835
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.*) 836
Mr. Broadhurst ... 838
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) ... 840
Mr Charles Allen (*Gloucestershire, Stroud*) ... 841
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) ... 842
Mr. Fenwick (*Northumberland, Wansbeck*) ... 844
Mr John Wilson (*Durham Mid.*) ... 845
Mr. Butcher (*York*) ... 846
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) ... 847
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) ... 848
Mr. Bell (*Derby*) ... 848
Mr. Heywood Johnstone ... 849
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 849
Mr Lyttelton (*Warwick and Leamington*)... 850

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the first word 'the,' and insert the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Question proposed, "That the first word 'the,' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 1:—

Motion made, and Question proposed—"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) ... 852

Motion made, and Question proposed— "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Ritchie, Croydon*)... 852
Mr. Dalziel ... 854

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 23; Noes, 115. (Division List No. 502.)

Question again proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Dalziel... 855
Mr. Ritchie ... 855

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time tomorrow.

Nov. 13.] *Page*

Bankers (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*)... 856
The Attorney General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) ... 856

Committee report progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 13TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (STANDING ORDERS).—Petition from Royal and other burghs of Scotland, for a new Standing Order providing for the Suspension of Bills; to lie upon the Table 857

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Chesterfield; Clay Cross; Pleasley; and Cefn; to lie upon the Table ... 857

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Bridgwater (three); Glasgow; and Skipton; to lie upon the Table 857

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Clay Cross; Pleasley; Cefn; and Chesterfield; to lie upon the Table 857

FEES FOR BURIAL SERVICES IN PAROCHIAL CEMETERIES.—Petition from Shoreditch, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table 857

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation; from Chesterfield; Clay Cross; Pleasley; and Cefn; to lie upon the Table ... 857

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1902.—Copy presented, of Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the Colonies and other possessions of the United Kingdom for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 857

TREATY SERIES (No. 14, 1902).—Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting import duties in Zanzibar. Signed at Washington, 31st May, 1902. Ratifications exchanged, 17th October, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 857

Nov. 13.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SCHOOLMASTERS' HOUSES.—Question, Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthsire, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 858

PORT ELLEN—DELAY OF MAILS.—Question, Mr. Nicol (Argyll); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 858

LONDON TELEGRAPH OPERATORS—QUALIFICATIONS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 859

PACIFIC CABLE—RATES.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 859

BOARD OF EDUCATION INSPECTORS—MR. H. M. RICHARDS.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Sir. William Anson 859

EDUCATION BILL—DEFINITION OF "SCHOOL" IN CLAUSE 15 (A).—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray; Answer, Sir William Anson 860

EDUCATION BILL—CREDIT BALANCES IN HANDS OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOL MANAGERS.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Sir William Anson 860

EDUCATION BILL—MEMBERS OF EDUCATION COMMITTEE INTERESTED IN CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Mansfield; Answer, Sir William Anson ... 860

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS) RETURN—ALTERATIONS SINCE COMMISSIONING.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 861

FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACT, 1901—LOCAL INQUIRIES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas ... 862

COMMITTEE ON CONSULAR SERVICE.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Lord Cranborne 862

DELAYS IN THE DUBLIN COURTS.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 862

DISCHARGING FIREARMS ON THE PUBLIC ROAD.—Question, Mr. John Campbell (Armagh S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 863

OFFICERS' BARRACKS FURNITURE.—Question, Mr. Halsey (Hertfordshire, Watford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 863

SOUTH AFRICA—TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR (BRITISH SUBJECTS.)—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 863

1ST AND 2ND ARMY CORPS—NUMBER OF EFFECTIVE MEN.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 864

VOLUNTEER REGULATIONS—EXEMPTIONS FROM CAMP ATTENDANCE.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 864

MOUNTAIN AND GARRISON ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 865

NEWFOUNDLAND—PREFERENTIAL TARIFF FOR EMPIRE PRODUCTS.—Question, Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 865

WORKING OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT IN COUNTY MONAGHAN.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 866

Page

SPREAD OF CONSUMPTION IN IRELAND.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 866

EMYVALE DISPENSARY (COUNTY MONAGHAN) — SALARY OF MEDICAL OFFICER.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 867

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVY—NEW ZEALAND COAL FOR THE CHINA SQUADRON.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 868

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing.) 868

JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION IN BENGAL PRESIDENCY.—Question, Mr. Barlow (Somersetshire, Frome); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 868

CHINA MAILS.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) ... 869

P. AND O. AND ORIENT MAIL CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 869

RE-DIRECTION OF TELEGRAMS.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 869

AGE RETIREMENTS IN THE TELEGRAPH SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 870

WELSH AND IRISH-SPEAKING POSTAL OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 870

SIR HORACE RUMBOLD'S REMINISCENCES.—Question, Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 871

LAND GRANTS IN BRITISH EAST AFRICAN PROTECTORATES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland); Answer, Lord Cranborne ... 871

LARBERT RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 872

DISTRICT COUNCIL BUILDING BYE-LAWS.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 872

BUNCRANA AND CARNDONAGH RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 873

TOLSTA (ISLAND OF LEWIS) SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 874

SOUTHWARK DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, Mr. Lees Knowles (Salford, W.) 874

Nov. 13.] *Page*

COUNTESTHORPE SCHOOL BOARD.—Question, Mr. Logan, (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 875

EDUCATION BILL—TRANSFERRED DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel and Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answers, Sir William Anson 876

LIMAVADY SESSIONS.—HENRY AND OTHERS v. HAMILL AND MOODY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 877

LONDONDERRY AND DONEGAL UNION BOUNDARIES.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 877

ROSCREA PETTY SESSIONAL BENCH.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 878

DISPENSARY DOCTORS AS COUNTY COUNCILLORS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 878

TEACHING OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 878

BELFAST POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 879

DROGHEDA SCHOOL TEACHER.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 879

USE OF IRISH COURT-HOUSES BY RURAL DISTRICT COUNCILS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 879

IRISH UNION AMALGAMATION.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 880

MR. JOSEPH MACAULEY, J.P.—Questions, Mr. Sloan and Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 880

CARNDONAGH MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 881

EDUCATION BILL RATE.—Question, Sir James Rankin (Herefordshire, Leominster); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 881

PROPOSED MINISTRY OF COMMERCE.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 882

NAVAL ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 882

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 13:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, after the word 'council,' to insert the words 'including the reasonable travelling expenses of the members of the Education Committee.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the first word 'the,' and insert the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Question again proposed, "That the first word 'the' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.*) 883
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 886
Mr. Milvain (*Hampstead*)... 887
Mr. Goulding (*Wiltshire, Devizes*)... 888
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 888
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 890
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 892
Mr. Wharton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon*) 893
Sir Joseph Leese (*Lancashire, Accrington*)... 893
Mr. A. J. Balfour 893
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 896
Mr. H. J. Wilson (*Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth*) 897
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid*) 897
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 897
The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 898

Question, "That the first word 'the' stand part of the proposed Amendment," put, and negatived.

Amendment further amended, by inserting—

"After the word 'including,' the word 'such,' and by inserting, after the word 'committee,' the words 'as the local education authority may think fit.'"—(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 130; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 503.)

Mr Louis Sinclair (*Essex, Romford*) 901

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, after the word 'Council,' to insert the words 'shall be paid under this Act out of a rate levied by the Council on the basis of the assessment for the poor rate.'"—(*Mr. Louis Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Walter Long 903
Sir Fortescue Flannery (*Yorkshire W.R., Shipley*) 905
Sir Charles Dilke 905
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 906
Mr. F. W. Wilson (*Norfolk, Mid*)... 906
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*)... 906
Mr. Walter Long 906

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir James Woodhouse (*Huddersfield*) 907

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 24, after the word 'rate,' to insert the words 'or a separate rate to be made, assessed, and levied in like manner as the borough rate.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Nov. 13.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'or,' to insert the words 'if no borough rate is levied.'"—(*Mr. Fison.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Walter Long 907

Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 25, after the word 'district,' to insert the words 'other than a borough.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir William Anson 908

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, lines 25 and 26, to leave out the words 'as expenses incurred for the general purposes of the Public Health Acts,' and insert the words 'in manner provided by Section 33 of the Elementary Education Act, 1876, as respects the expenses in that Section.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Bryce 908
Sir Robert Finlay 908
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 909
Mr. Samuel Evans... 909
Mr. Walter Long 909

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Channing 909

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 26, at end, to insert the words, '(*a*) The County Council shall not raise any sum on account of their expenses under Part II. of this Act within any urban district the council of which is an education authority for the purposes of Part III. of this Act, and which has levied a rate under Section 3 of this Act for the purposes of education other than elementary, save and so far as the proceeds of any such county rate may be applied for the supply or aid of education other than elementary within such urban district; and (*b*).'"—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Nov. 13.]

Page
Mr. Walter Long 910
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 910
Mr. Brynmor Jones (*Swansea Districts*) 911
Mr. Channing 912
Mr. Lloyd-George 913

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 26, at end, to insert the words '(*a*) the Council shall make an estimate of the amount of their expenses under this Act.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Walter Long 914
Mr. Samuel Evans... 914
Sir John Dorington (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 915
Mr. Brynmor Jones 915

Amendment proposed to the Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'distinguishing the amount to be expended upon schools provided and schools not provided by the local education authority.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 915
Mr. Henry Hobhouse 916
Sir Charles Dilke 916
Mr. Brigg (*Yorkshire W. R., Keighley*) 917
Mr. Samuel Evans... 917
Sir John Brunner (*Cheshire, Northwich*) 917
Mr. Walter Long 917
Mr. Lloyd-George 918

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 127 ; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 504.)

Mr. Trevelyan 921

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, to leave out sub-Section (*a*)."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (*a*) stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Walter Long 924
Sir Charles Dilke 925
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 926
Mr. Henry Hobhouse 927
Mr. Emmott 928
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 928
Mr. Barran (*Leeds, N.*) 929
Sir Robert Finlay 930

Nov. 13.] *Page*

Mr. Lloyd-George ... 930
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) ... 931
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice ... 931
Mr. Herbert Lewis ... 932
Sir John Dorington ... 932
Mr. Wharton ... 933
Mr. Bryce ... 934
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) ... 934

Question not agreed to.

Sir Charles Dilke ... 935

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 27, after the word 'fit,' to insert the words 'subject to notice to the minor local authority.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Walter Long ... 935

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bryce ... 935

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 29, after the word 'elementary,' to insert the words 'and in respect of capital expenditure.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Walter Long ... 936

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 122; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 505.)

Sir Charles Dilke ... 939

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 35, to leave out the words from the word 'part,' to the end of line 44."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and the County Council' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 941
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) ... 941
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) ... 942
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 942

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 13:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 35, to leave out the words from the word 'Part,' to the end of line 44."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question again proposed—

"That the words 'and the County Council' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Samuel Evans ... 943
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) ... 944

Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 506.)

Mr. Runciman ... 947

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words, 'subject to notice to the local education authority."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Walter Long ... 947

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Herbert Lewis ... 947

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 36, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the words 'may if they think fit.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 948
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 949
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) ... 950
Mr. Sydney Buxton ... 951
Sir John Brunner ... 952
Dr. Macnamara ... 952
Mr. Walter Long ... 953
Mr. Bryce ... 954
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 955
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) ... 956

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 214 ; Noes, 100. (Division List, No. 507.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 959

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'charge,' to insert the words 'such portion as they think fit, not being less than one-half or more than three-fourths of.' "—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Amendment agreed to—

Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 959

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 41, to leave out sub-Section (*d*)."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the County Council shall' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 961
Sir Charles Dilke 962
Dr. Macnamara 962
Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) 964
Mr. Channing 964

Question put, "That the words 'The County Council shall' stand part of the Clause.' "

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 232 ; Noes, 128. (Division List, No. 508.)

It being after Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 41, after the word 'raise' to insert the words 'such portions as they think fit, not being less than one-half or more than three-fourths of.' "—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 232 ; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 509.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 42, after the word 'liabilities' to insert the words, 'on account of loans.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 236 ; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 510.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 44, at the end, to insert the words 'so far as it is within their area.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Nov. 13.]

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 238; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 511.)

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 12, at the end, to add the words, '(4) Where under any local Act the expenses incurred in any borough for the purposes of the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, are payable out of some fund or rate other than the borough fund or rate, the expenses of the council of that borough under this Act shall be payable out of that fund or rate instead of out of the borough fund or rate; (5) Where any receipts or payments of money under this Act are entrusted by the local education authority to any committee or managers, the accounts of these receipts and payments shall be accounts of the local education authority.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 234; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 512.)

Question put, "That the Clause as amended stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 234; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 513.)

Clause 14:—

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 18, after the word 'borough,' to insert the words 'or urban district.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 219; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 514.)

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 19, to leave out the second word 'borough.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the word 'borough' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 102; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 515.)

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 19, at the end, to add the words 'out of which the expenses of the Council under this Act are payable.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 204; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 516.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 517.)

Clause 15:—

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 29, to leave out the words, 'A local education authority,' and insert the words, 'An authority having powers under this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Nov. 13.]

Question put, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 88; Noes, 189. (Division List No. 518.)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 186; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 519.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, lines 38 and 39, to leave out the words, 'which has power to adopt, or has adopted, Part III. of this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 520.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 43, to leave out the words from the word 'Act,' to the end of the Clause, and to add the words, 'and in that case the powers and duties of the authority under this Act shall cease, and the area of the authority, if the powers and duties relinquished include powers as to elementary education, shall as respects those powers and duties be part of the area of the County Council.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 81; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 521.)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 522.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 523.)

Clause 16:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words, 'as respects a Provisional Order constituting an Education Committee.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 81; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 524.)

Question put, "That the words, 'and any such scheme or any Provisional Order made for the purposes of such a scheme' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 168; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 526.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 19, at the end, to add the words 'as a scheme for establishing an Education Committee under this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 167; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 527.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 166; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 528.)

Clause 17:—

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 61; Noes, 154. (Division List No. 529.)

The CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Three o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 1033

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Enfield (five); Southgate; Edmonton; Stirling; and Gloucester; to lie upon the Table 1033

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Frampton-on-Severn, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1033

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Wavertree, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1033

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Aldborough; Adlington; and Hunstanton; to lie upon the Table... ... 1033

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Additional Rule varying the Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 371.] 1033

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).—Copy presented, of Eleventh General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 372.] 1033

NAVAL EXPENDITURE AND MERCANTILE MARINE (GREAT BRITAIN, ETC.)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th June; *Sir John Colomb*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed]. No. 373.] 1033

Nov. 14.] *Page*

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2913 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1034

COUNTY BOROUGHS (IRELAND).—Return ordered, "showing (1) the total rateable value of each of the County Boroughs in Ireland; (2) the borrowing powers of each, distinguishing between their powers under the Public Health (Ireland) Act and local Acts (if any); (3) the amount borrowed by each County Borough on the security of the rates, distinguishing loans from (a) Local Loans Fund, (b) stock, (c) other sources (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January last); (4) the amount of loans repaid up to the 1st day of January last (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January last); (5) the rate in the pound for all purposes levied in each County Borough during the years 1899, 1900, and 1901; and (6) the income (if any) of each County Borough from sources other than the rates."—(*Mr. O'Doherty.*) 1034

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EDUCATION BILL—EXPENSES OF LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1034

SOLDIERS' GRATUITIES ON TRANSFER TO RESERVE OR DISCHARGE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1034

FOREIGN MADE PENCILS IN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1035

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY—BREAKDOWN NEAR CARMARTHEN.—Question, Mr. Philipps (Pembrokeshire); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1035

CROWN PROPERTY IN SCOTLAND—ARREARS OF INCOME.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1036

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—CHARGES AGAINST BRITISH OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1036

ARMY PROMOTIONS—CASE OF VETERINARY CAPTAIN SPANTON.—Question, Mr. John Wilson (Glasgow, St. Rollox); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1036

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

EDUCATION BILL—THE GOVERNMENT AMENDMENTS.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1037

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 18—

Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 1038

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 28, to leave out sub-Section (1)."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed "That sub-Section (1) stand part of the Clause."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) ... 1040
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 1042
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) ... 1043
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N. W.) ... 1045
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) ... 1047
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) ... 1047
Sir William Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) ... 1048
Sir James Rankin (Herefordshire, Leominster) ... 1049
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) ... 1049
Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping) ... 1050
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) ... 1051
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) ... 1051
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 1052
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid) ... 1053
Sir John Gorst ... 1054
Mr. Bryce ... 1054
Mr. Helme ... 1055
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1055
Dr. Macnamara ... 1055
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) ... 1056
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) ... 1056
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1057

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 31, after 'education,' to insert the words 'where any part of the education given is other than elementary.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Bryce ... 1057

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 35, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'to pupil teachers and.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir John Gorst ... 1057
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice ... 1058
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) ... 1058
Mr. Bryce ... 1058

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Dr. Macnamara ... 1059

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 36, to leave out the words 'of not more than fifteen years of age.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Sir William Anson ... 1059
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) ... 1060
Sir John Gorst ... 1061

Page

Mr. Edmund Robertson ... 1062
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid) ... 1062
Sir Francis Powell ... 1063

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bryce ... 1064

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 37, at end, to insert the words 'but any scholar may remain in such school to the close of the school year in which he or she reaches the age of fifteen.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 37, at end, to insert the words '(3) Where before the passing of this Act fees have been charged in any public elementary school the local education authority shall, while they continue to charge fees in respect of that school, pay such proportion of those fees as may be agreed upon, or, in default of agreement, determined by the Board of Education, to the managers.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Mr. Whitley ... 1064
Mr. Edmund Robertson ... 1065

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 41, at end, to insert the words '(4) In this Act the expression "minor local authority" means the council of any borough or urban district, or the parish council or (where there is no parish council) the parish meeting of any parish, which appears to the County Council to be served by the school. Where the school appears to the County Council to serve the area of more than one minor local authority the County Council shall make such provision as they think proper for joint appointment by the authorities concerned.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Bryce ... 1066

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 41, at end, to insert the words '(4) In this Act the words "persons" and "managers," shall include women.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1066

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Whitley ... 1066

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 3, at end, to insert the words 'The powers of a local education authority under this Act shall include the provision of vehicles or the payment of reasonable travelling expenses for teachers or children attending school wherever the local education authority shall consider such provision or payment required by the circumstances of their district or any part thereof.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 8, line 3, to add, as a new sub-Section, '(5) In this Act the expression "college" includes any educational institution, whether residential or not.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1067
Mr. James Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 1067
Sir Robert Finlay 1067

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

> "After the word 'institution' to insert the words 'not being a theological college.' "—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Sir Robert Finlay 1068
Mr. Lloyd-George 1068

Question put.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 94; Noes, 191. (Division List No. 530.)

Words [of SIR WILLIAM ANSON'S Amendment] inserted.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 8, line 4, to leave out the words 'local education authority' and insert the word 'council.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 8, line 7, at end, to add: 'And shall include power to provide or assist in providing scholarships for, and to pay or assist in paying the fees of, students ordinarily resident in the area of the local education authority at schools or colleges or hostles within or without that area.'
>
> " '(6) The county councillors elected for an electoral division consisting wholly of a borough or urban district, whose council is a local education authority for the purpose of Part III. of this Act, or of some part of such a borough or district shall not act or vote in respect of any question arising before the County Council as regards matters under Part III. of this Act.
>
> " '(7) A woman is not disqualified, either by sex or marriage, for being on any body of managers or Education Committee under this Act.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 1072

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 8, to leave out sub-Section (6), and insert the words 'For the purposes of this Act the census of 1901, until superseded by any future census, shall be the test of population.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, stand part of the Clause."

Sir Robert Finlay 1072
Mr. Samuel Evans... 1072

Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 102; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 531.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 206; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 532.)

It being half-past Four of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every question necessary to dispose of the allotted business.

Clause 19:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 10, after the second word 'the,' to insert the words 'First and.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 533.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 204; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 534.)

Clause 20:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 31, to leave out from the word 'authorities' to the end of line 35, and insert the words, 'the period during which local authorities may, under the Education Act, 1901, as renewed by the Education Act (1901) (Renewal) Act, 1902, empower School Boards to carry on the work of the schools and classes to which these Acts relate shall be extended to the appointed day, and in the case of London to the twenty-sixth day of March, nineteen hundred and four.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 204. (Division List No. 535.)

Words inserted.

Nov. 17.] *Page*

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 197 ; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 536.)

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

EDUCATION ENGLAND AND WALES (GRANTS).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of certain annual grants to local education authorities in pursuance of any Act of the present session to make further provision with respect to education in England and Wales."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

It being after half-past Four of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put the Question forthwith.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 191 ; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 537.)

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY, 17TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade—

I. Authorising the construction of : (1) A light railway in the county of Southampton from Bentley to Borton ; (2) Light railways in the city of Wakefield, the borough of Osset, and in the townships of Horbury, Lofthouse-with-Carlton, Thorpe, Rothwell, Landal-Magna, Oulton-with-Woodlesford, and in the parishes of Rothwell, East Ardsley, and Outwood, in the West Riding of the County of York ; (3) Light railways in the borough of Morley and the urban districts of Birkenshaw, Drighlington, and Gomersal in the West Riding of the county of York ; and for other purposes.

II. Amending : (1) The Crowland and District Light Railways Order, 1898 ; (2) The South Norfolk Light Railway Order, 1898 ... 1097

Nov. 17.] *Page*

Mercantile Marine (Seamen Employed).—Return of the number, ages, ratings, and nationalities of the seamen employed on the 31st day of March, 1901, on vessels registered under Part I. of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in the British Islands 1097

Trade Unions, Board of Trade (Labour Department).—Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade, on trade unions in 1901; with comparative statistics for 1892-1900 1097

Colonial Import Duties, 1902.—Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the Colonies and other Possessions of the United Kingdom.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 1097

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Treasury minute, dated 10th November, 1902, declaring that James Bowden, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department... 1097

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1896.—Two orders, dated respectively the 7th and 10th days of November, 1902, the former entitled the Bristol (Avonmouth Dock) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902, and the latter revoking three Orders relating to the landing in Great Britain of animals brought from the Channel Islands 1098

Companies (Winding-up).—Eleventh general annual report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890 ... 1098

Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888.—Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents' Rules, 1889.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table... 1098

Bankruptcy.—Return respecting: laid before the House (pursuant to order of 6th of June last), and to be printed. (No. 186.) 1098

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway (Abandonment) Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed 1098

Representation in House of Lords of the Board of Trade.
The Lord President of the Council (*The Duke of Devonshire*) 1099

Standing Orders XXXIX. and XLV. considered (according to Order), and suspended for this day's Sitting.

Water Provisional Order Bill.—Moved that the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Thursday the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª (The Lord Wolverton); agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly: Committee negatived. Then (Standing Orders Nos. XXXIX. and XLV. having been suspended) Bill read 3ª, and passed 1099

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill; Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill; Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1099

Patent Law Amendment Bill.—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Wolverton 1099

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

Lord Davey 1101
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 1102

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: the said Amendments to be printed; and to be considered on Thursday next. (No. 187.) 1103

House adjourned at Ten minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 17TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.—MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a letter relating to the Imprisonment of a Member 1103

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—

Water Provisional Order Bill,
Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill,
Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill,
Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill,
Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway (Abandonment) Bill.

Amendments to—

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill [Lords],
Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill [Lords],
Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill [Lords],
North-West London Railway Bill [Lords],
Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, &c.) Bill [Lords],
without Amendment... 1103

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table 1104

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Little Woolton; Southampton; and Garston; to lie upon the Table ... 1104

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.—Copies presented, of two Orders dated respectively the 7th and 10th November, 1902, the former entitled the Bristol (Avonmouth Dock) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902, and the latter revoking three Orders relative to the landing in Great Britain of animals brought from the Channel Islands [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1104

Nov. 17.] *Page*

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 10th November, 1902, declaring that James Bowden, Royal Laboratory, War Office Department, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1104

LONDON WATER AREA.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th November; *Mr. Rea*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 374.] 1105

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2914 (by Command); to lie upon the Table 1105

SAMOA (NO. 1, 1902).—Copy presented, of Decision given by His Majesty Oscar II., King of Sweden and Norway, as Arbitrator under the Convention signed at Washington, 7th November, 1899, between the German Empire, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the United States of America, relating to the settlement of certain claims on account of Military operations conducted in Samoa in the year 1899. Given at Stockholm, 14th October, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 1105

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—MEDALS FOR TRANSPORT OFFICERS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1105

NEW ZEALAND COAL FOR THE CHINA SQUADRON.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Foster 1105

EDUCATION BILL—POSITION OF ATTENDANCE OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Joseph Howard (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Sir William Anson 1106

EDUCATION BILL—CLAUSE 13—AUDIT OF MUNICIPAL ACCOUNTS.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... ... 1106

NON-PAYMENT OF RATES (SCOTLAND) RETURN.—Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lancashire, Mid.); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1107

PORT NESS (LEWIS) HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1107

ISLAND OF LEWIS—LANDLESS COTTARS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1108

CABLE COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE—STATE PURCHASE OF CABLES.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1108

IRISH TRUNK TELEPHONE SYSTEM.—Question, The Marquess of Hamilton (Londonderry); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1109

TELEGRAPH SERVICE—MALE AND FEMALE CLERKS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1109

BRITISH POST OFFICE AT JERUSALEM AND PEKING.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1110

INDIA—ACREAGE OF CULTIVATED LANDS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1111

Page

UGANDA RAILWAY.—Question, Sir Alfred Hickman (Wolverhampton, W.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1111

NAVAL ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—PROMOTIONS.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1112

MSS. ORDNANCE SURVEY MEMOIRS OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1112

HISTORICAL RELICS AT GREENAN, LONDONDERRY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1113

ROAD LABOUR SCHEME FOR COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1114

DUNGANNON EXTRA POLICE.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, S); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1114

LICENSING CASE AT SNEEM, KERRY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham... 1115

ARMY—LODGING ALLOWANCES FOR OFFICERS AND THEIR SERVANTS AT HONG KONG.—Question, Sir John Tulse (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1116

EDUCATION BILL—TRUST ENDOWMENTS.—Question, Mr. John Hutton (Yorkshire, Richmond); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1116

TRANSPORT—THE "BRITANNIC."—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1116

LONDON TRAFFIC AND COMMUNICATION—PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Bond (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1116

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

UNEMPLOYED RESERVISTS.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1117

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HONOURS FOR WAR OFFICE OFFICIALS.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1117

SOUTH AFRICAN MEDALS.—Question, Mr. Butcher (York); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1118

ROBERT LEONARD, 6TH DRAGOONS.—Question, Mr. George Faber (York); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1118

H.M.S. "DIADEM."—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) ... 1118

H.M.S. "TERRIBLE."—Question, Sir William Allan; Answer, Mr. Pretyman ... 1119

INDIA—CONDUCT OF 9TH LANCERS AT SIALKOTE—INDISCRIMINATE PUNISHMENT OF THE REGIMENT.—Questions, Major Rasch, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.), and Col. Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) ... 1119

INDIAN NATIVE ARMY COLONELS.—Question, Capt. Norton; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1120

Nov. 17.] Page

BROADMOOR CRIMINAL LUNATIC ASYLUM.—Question, Capt. Norton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1121

SUNDAY TRADING PROSECUTIONS AT DARTMOUTH.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1121

ISLINGTON PARISH CHURCH BELLS—COST OF RINGING ON KING'S BIRTHDAY.—Question, Lieut.-Col. Tuffnell (Essex, S.E.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1122

NEW STREET FROM CHARING CROSS TO THE MALL.—Question, Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Hunts, Ramsey) 1123

GLASGOW CORPORATION AND THE CLYDE.—Question, Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1123

EDUCATION BILL—PROVIDED SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Duncan (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1123

RETURN OF SCHOOLS CHARGING FEES.—Question, Mr. Batty Langley (Sheffield, Attercliffe); Answer, Sir William Anson 1123

ROSCOMMON COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL ELECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, the Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1124

BELFAST WINTER ASSIZES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson ... 1124

LONGFORD REGISTRY OF TITLES.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1125

PROSECUTION OF HERBERT LINDSAY AT BELFAST.—Questions, Mr. Sloan and Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Atkinson 1125

ROCK ANGUS LIGHTS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) ... 1127

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1127

INSPECTION OF IRISH POOR LAW BOARDED-OUT CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1127

TALLOW CONSPIRACY TRIAL.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham... 1128

IRISH COURT HOUSES.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham... ... 1128

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1129

IRISH LAND BILL.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1129

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1129

MUNICIPAL TRADING—SUGGESTED ROYAL COMMISSION.—Questions, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1130

Nov. 17.]

Page

EDUCATION BILL—LEASED SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1130

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1131

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) GRANTS [14TH NOVEMBER]—REPORT.

Resolution reported: "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of certain annual grants to local education authorities in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to make further provision with respect to education in England and Wales."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1132
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1133
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1133
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*) 1137
Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1139
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 1139
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1141
Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*)... 1142
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1142

Resolution agreed to.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1144

New Clause (Aid Grant)—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*)—brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Sir Charles Dilke 1146
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*)... 1148
Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*)... 1151
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1153
Sir H. Meysey-Thompson (*Staffordshire, Handsworth*) 1154
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, N.*) 1154

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*) 1155

Amendment proposed to the Clause—

"In line 1, to leave out the words, 'And under Section 97 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, as amended by the Elementary Education Act, 1897.'"—(*Mr. Ernest Gray.*)

Nov. 17.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1160
Sir Charles Dilke 1161
Major Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) 1162
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 1163
Mr. D. J. Morgan (*Essex, Walthamstow*)... 1163

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Louis Sinclair (*Essex, Romford*) 1163

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to leave out 'a sum equal to 4s. per scholar' in order to insert 'Wherever the product of 1d. rate in the area of the authority is more than 2s. 6d. per scholar, a sum equal to 3s. per scholar.'"—(*Mr. Louis Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir Robert Finlay 1164

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Gibson Bowles 1164
Sir Robert Finlay 1165

Amendment made to the Clause—

"In line 8, after the words 'twopence,' by inserting the words 'per scholar.'"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

Mr. Herbert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1165

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, to the Clause, as amended, to leave out the word 'authority,' and insert the words 'parish served by the schools.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'authority' stand part of the Clause, as amended."—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Sir Robert Finlay (*Inverness Burghs*) 1166
Sir Charles Dilke 1166
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid*) 1167

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 206; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 538.)

Mr. M'Kenna 1169

Amendment moved—

"In line 9, at end, to add—'provided that in estimating the produce of a 1d. rate in the area of the local education authority, not being a county borough, the rate shall be calculated on the assessment for county rates.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir Robert Finlay 1171
Mr. Herbert Lewis... 1171
Mr. Trevelyan 1171
Sir Robert Finlay 1172

Mr. M'Kenna's Amendment was withdrawn, and the words suggested by the Attorney-General were agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Clause, as amended—

"To leave out from the word 'but,' in line 10, to the word 'accordingly,' in line 15, both inclusive, and insert the words, 'If in any year the total amount of Parliamentary grants payable to the local education authority would make the amount payable out of other sources by that authority, on account of their expenses under Part III. of this Act, less than the amount which would be produced by a rate of 3d. in the pound, the Parliamentary grant shall be decreased, and the amount payable out of other sources shall be increased by a sum equal in each case to half the difference.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause, as amended."

Dr. Macnamara 1173

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Dr. Macnamara 1173

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'But,' and insert the words, 'the total amount paid to any local education authority on account of all the Parliamentary grants in respect of elementary education, including the grant under this Section, shall not in any year exceed four-fifths of the total expenses of the authority under Part III. of the Act, and the amount payable under this Section to a local education authority shall, where necessary, be reduced accordingly.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir Robert Finlay 1173
Mr. Whitley 1175
Mr. Alfred Hutton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Morley*) 1176
Dr. Macnamara 1177

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 219; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 539.)

Words inserted.

Sir Charles Dilke 1179

Amendment proposed—

> "After the words last inserted, to insert in the Clause the words, '(2) The amount paid under this Section shall be allocated by the local education authority in the first instance to the expenses referred to in paragraphs (*c*) and (*d*) of sub-Section 1 of Section 13, if any such expenses are incurred by them.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1181
Mr. Alfred Hutton 1182
Mr. Lloyd-George 1182
Mr. Channing 1182
Mr. Samuel Evans 1183
Dr. Macnamara 1184

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 95; Noes, 213. (Division List No. 540.)

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Question proposed, "That the proposed New Clause (Aid Grant), as amended, be added to the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1187
Sir Robert Finlay 1190
Mr. Alfred Hutton 1190
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) 1192
Mr. Ernest Gray 1192
Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) 1193
Mr. Lloyd-George 1193
Sir Robert Finlay 1193
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee)... 1196
Mr. Walter Long 1197
Mr. Bryce 1198

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added.

New Clause:—

> "(1) Nothing in this Section shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof: Provided that, where under the trusts or other provisions affecting any endowment the income thereof must be applied in whole or in part for those purposes of a public elementary school for which provision is to be made by the local education authority, the whole of the income or the part thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to that authority, and in case part only of

such income must be so applied, and there is no provision under the said trusts or provisions for determining the amount which represents that part, that amount shall be determined in case of difference between the parties concerned by the Board of Education. (2) Any money arising from an endowment and paid to a County Council for those purposes of a public elementary school for which provision is to be made by the Council, shall be credited by the Council, in aid of the rate levied for the purposes of Part III. of this Act in the parish or parishes served by the school for the purposes of which the sum is paid, or if the Council so direct shall be paid to the overseers of the parish or parishes in the proportions directed by the Council, and applied by the overseers in aid of the poor rate levied in the parish."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Edmund Robertson ... 1200
Mr. M'Kenna ... 1200
Mr. Bryce ... 1201
Mr. A. K. Loyd (*Berkshire, Abingdon*) ... 1202
Sir William Anson ... 1202
Mr. Herbert Lewis ... 1203
Mr. Bryce ... 1204
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tonbridge*) ... 1206
Mr. Stevenson (*Suffolk, Eye*) ... 1208
Major Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) ... 1209
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) ... 1209
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 1210
Sir William Anson ... 1212
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) ... 1214
Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) ... 1215
Sir William Anson ... 1217

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 182; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 541.)

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice ... 1221

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the words '(1) Nothing in this section shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof. Provided that.'"—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson ... 1221
Mr. M'Kenna ... 1222
Mr. Whitley ... 1222
Mr. Griffith Boscawen ... 1223
Mr. Bryce ... 1223

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 18th NOVEMBER, 1902.

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—
Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1).
Water Provisional Order.
Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation.
Dunbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation.
Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation.
Richmond Hill (Preservation of View).
South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.
Baker Street and Waterloo Railway.
Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway.
Edgware and Hampstead Railway.
North-West London Railway.
Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, &c.).
Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway (Abandonment) 1225

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 2914. Japan (Kobe).

SAMOA No. 1 (1902).—Decision given by His Majesty Oscar II., King of Sweden and Norway, as arbitrator under the Convention signed at Washington the 7th of November, 1899, between the German Empire, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the United States of America, relating to the statement of certain claims on account of military operations conducted in Samoa in the year 1899; given at Stockholm, 14th October, 1902.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 1225

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891.—Licence to be at large granted by His Majesty to Henry Goodwin under the Provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule "A" of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1225

House adjourned at Four o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION.—Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, being returned—

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills [see page 1225] 1226

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Coatbridge; Burnbank; Grahamston; Shettleston; to lie upon the Table 1 2

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Maulden; Hamilton; Sheffield; and Suffolk; to lie upon the Table 122

Page

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: From Burnbank; Shettleston; Coatbridge; and Grahamston; to lie upon the Table 1226

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Anfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1226

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Sleat, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1226

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition for legislation; from Coatbridge; Burnbank; Grahamston; and Shettleston; to lie upon the Table 1227

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).—Copy presented of licence granted to Henry Goodwin, a convict, permitting him to be at large, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule "A" of The Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1227

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).—Copy presented of University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow No. 2) (Regulations for Degrees in Science in Public Health) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 375] 1227

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS—ENTRANCE FEES.—Question, Mr. Philipps (Pembroke); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1227

NAVY—COST OF TRAINING SEAMEN.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1228

H.M.S. "TERRIBLE"—CHRISTMAS LEAVE.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1228

EDUCATION BILL—AGRICULTURAL GRANT.—Question, Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose); Answer, Sir William Anson 1228

APPOINTMENT OF SCHOOL MANAGERS.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Sir William Anson 1229

RESPONSIBILITY OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS.—Question, Mr. Mansfield; Answer, Sir William Anson 1229

EDUCATION COMMITTEES—DELEGATION OF WORK TO LOCAL COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Joseph A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1230

POSITION OF CANN, HULL DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1230

ARREST OF MR. LYNCH, M.P.—Question, Mr. Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1230

TREATMENT OF JEWS IN ROUMANIA.—Question, Major Evans-Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Lord Cranborne... 1231

IRELAND—RAILWAY LOANS—CARNDONAGH—CALDUFF RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1231

Nov. 18.] *Page*

State Purchase of Irish Railways.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1232

Cavalry and Infantry Officers' Entrance Examinations.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 2232

Army Promotions—Length of Service.—Question, Sir R. Penrose-Fitzgerald (Cambridge); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 1233

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Island of Lewis—Social Condition.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1233

Aird School Playground, Stornoway.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1233

Island of Lewis—Local Government Inspection.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1234

Mid-Week United States Mails.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1234

Stornoway Mail Service.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1235

St. John's Church Day Schools, Sutton-on-Plym.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur; Answer, The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1236

Plymtree Schoolroom.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Sir William Anson 1236

Irish-Speaking Magistrates and Post Office Officials.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1237

Grant for Publication of Irish MSS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1237

Michael Muldowney.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1238

Business of the House—Indian Budget Debate.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1238

China Squadron—Supply of New Zealand Coal.—Questions, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge)... 1238

War Office Clothing Contracts.—Question, Mr. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1239

Commissions for Militia Officers.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1240

Army Canteens.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Lord Stanley 1240

Nov. 18.] *Page*

UGANDA RAILWAY RATES.—Question, Mr. Johnstone; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) .. 1241

INCOME TAX RETURNS.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1241

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL—WILL OF QUEEN VICTORIA.—Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 1241

CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND INCOME TAX.—Questions, Mr. Lambert; Answers, Mr. Ritchie 1242

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.—Ordered, that a message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Lord Welby to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee on National Expenditure.—(*Sir James Fergusson*) 1242

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (London) (No. 2) Bill.—

Orders for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn ... 1242

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the words: '(1) Nothing in this Act shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustee in respect thereof: provided that.'"—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye) 1243
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1243
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1244
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) 1244
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 1245
Mr. Duncan (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley) 1245
The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1245
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1246
Sir William Tomlinson (Preston)... 1247
Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) 1247
Sir William Anson 1248
Mr. Samuel Evans 1248
Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire) 1249
The Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1250
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1251
Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs) 1251
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid.) 1252
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1253
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 1255
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 1255
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 1256
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 1253

Nov. 18.] Page

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 172; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 542.)

Mr. Samuel Evans 1260

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'where,' to insert the words 'on the first day of January, nineteen hundred and one.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1261
Mr. Lloyd-George 1262

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 100; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 543.)

Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) 1267

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'trusts or other provisions,' and insert the words 'original trusts.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson 1269
Mr. M'Kenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1269
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*)... 1270
Mr. Lloyd-George 1271
Mr. Bryce 1272
Mr. Logan (*Leicestershire, Harborough*) 1273
Mr. Soares 1274

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 218; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 544.)

Mr. George Whiteley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey*) 1277

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'must,' and to insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'must' stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson... 1278
Mr. Corrie Grant 1278

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 221; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 545.)

Mr. Samuel Evans... 1281

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, to leave out the words from the word 'applied' to the word 'Education,' in line 11, inclusive, and insert the words 'by express provisions of the trust in whole or in part exclusively for the purpose of giving instruction in religious subjects in a public elementary school, and for no other purpose; the income or part thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the managers for that purpose, and in all other cases, and subject thereto, the income or the residue thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the education authority.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans*).

Question proposed, "That the words 'in whole or in part for' stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson... 1283
Mr. M'Kenna 1284
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 1284
Mr. Bryce 1285
Mr. Corrie Grant 1285

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 277; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 546.)

Mr. Lloyd-George 1289

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, to leave out the word 'those,' and insert the word 'the.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'those' stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson 1292
Mr. Samuel Evans 1293
Mr. Asquith (*Fife, E.*) 1293
Mr. Corrie Grant 1294
Mr. Soares... 1295
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1295
Mr. Herbert Lewis... 1296

Question put,

The Committee divided: Ayes, 235; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 547.)

Mr. Corrie Grant 1299

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, to leave out the words 'of a public elementary school.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson 1301
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 1302

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 114. (Division List No. 548.)

Mr. Lloyd-George 1305

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'but the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to to the local education authority and to the minor local authority, shall have been first held by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson 1306
Mr. Bryce 1307
Mr. Samuel Evans ... ... — 1307

It being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Another Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'but the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to the local education authority and to the minor local authority, shall have been first held by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Samuel Evans 1308
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tonbridge*)... 1310
Sir William Anson 1311
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 1311
Sir William Anson 1312
Mr. Johnstone (*Sussex, Horsham*) 1312
Mr. Lloyd-George 1313
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 1314

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'education,' to insert the words 'but if a local inquiry is demanded by the local education authority the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to the local education authority and to the minor local authority and to the trustees, shall have been first held by the Board of Education.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Nov. 18.]

Page
Mr. Lloyd-George 1314
Mr. Bousfield 1315
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 1315

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

> "After the last word 'education,' to insert the words 'at the cost of the local education authority.'"—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1315
Sir John Gorst 1317
Dr. Macnamara 1317
Mr. Samuel Evans 1318
Sir Robert Finlay 1318
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 1319
Mr. Bryce 1319
Mr. Lloyd-George 1320

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 549)

Words, as amended, inserted.

Mr. M'Kenna 1323

Amendment proposed—

> "After the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'in determining any difference under this Section, the Board of Education shall have regard to the proportion in which the whole cost of the school is met out of funds provided by the local education authority and the foundation managers respectively.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson 1324
Mr. Samuel Evans 1324
Mr. Bousfield 1325
Mr. Ellis Griffith 1325

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 93; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 550.)

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 1329

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 14, at end, to insert the words 'to the parish or parishes served by the school, and shall, unless otherwise applied in pursuance of a scheme made by the Board of Education on the application of the County Council, be applied.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson 133
Mr. Bryce 133

Nov. 19.] *Page*

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'unless otherwise' and insert the word 'be.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1343

It being Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded forthwith to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair and on the New Clauses proposed by the Government.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 551.)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 552.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 553.)

New Clause (local authority's managers)—(*Sir William Anson*)—added.

New Clause (grouping of schools under one management)—(*Sir William Anson*)—added.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed for tomorrow 1344

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

BURGH POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Caithness, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1345

DOGS REGULATION BILL.—Petition from Caithness, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1345

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Greenfield; and Manchester; to lie upon the Table 1345

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Caithness, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1345

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Redhill, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 1345

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (SANITARY MEASURES).—Copy presented, of Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1900-1901, Vol. XXXIV. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1345

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Grants for School Teachers' Houses, 1843-1881 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1345

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.—Copies presented, of Minute sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the following counties:—

County of Carmarthen (First Minute), dated 21st October, 1902;

County of Salop (Fifth Minute), dated 21st October, 1902;

County of Glamorgan (Twelfth Minute), dated 15th October, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1345

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.—Copies presented, of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Northampton, Cornwall, Monmouth, and Berks) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1346

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EDUCATION BILL—CLAUSE 2—EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir James Rankin (Herefordshire, Leominster); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1346

BRITISH POSTAL ORDERS FROM TURKEY.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain... 1346

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS—RATES OF INTEREST.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1347

TELEGRAPH LEARNERS—STARTING PAY.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1347

SCOTTISH HARBOUR GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1347

POULTRY BREEDING IN LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1348

PORT NESS (LEWIS) HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1348

INLAND REVENUE (IRELAND)—GAME LICENSES.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1348

CIVIL SERVICE ABSTRACTORS.—Question, Mr. Skewes-Cox (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1349

POOR LAW — PROPOSED CENTRAL SUPERANNUATION FUND.—Question, Mr. Freeman Thomas (Hastings); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1349

UNPUBLISHED RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN POWERS.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Lord Cranborne... 1350

IRELAND—CONDUCT OF POLICE AT RATHCORMAC.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork Co., N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1351

ARMY RECRUITING SINCE CLOSE OF WAR.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1351

Nov. 19.] *Page*

RECRUITING—PHYSICAL STANDARDS.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee; Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 1351

BRITISH HONDURAS—MR. FENWICK'S EXPLORATIONS.—Question, Col. Sadler (Middlesborough); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1352

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—FURTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE BOERS.—Question. Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1352

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.—Questions, Sir John Leng (Dundee), and Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1353

KING'S SOUTH AFRICAN MEDAL.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Lord Stanley 1353

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY—MEDALS.—Questions, Mr. Yerburgh and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Lord Stanley 1354

RESERVISTS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Lord Stanley 1354

ARMY ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Lord Stanley 1355

WELSH AND NEW ZEALAND COAL.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 1355

H.M.S. "CRESSY."—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1356

H.M.S. "HYACINTH."—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1356

BRITISH TRADE IN THE FRENCH CONGO—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1356

KABYLE REVOLT IN MOROCCO.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1357

ALIENS IN LONDON.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 1358

POLICE OVERCOATS.—Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Mr. Cochrane 1358

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1359

POST OFFICE TELEPHONES.—Questions, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's), and Mr. Lough; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1359

SUPERVISION OF POSTAL OFFICIALS BY THEIR RELATIVES.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1360

EDUCATION BILL—EVENING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir Francis Powell (Wigan); Answer, The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1361

Nov. 19.] *Page*

WELSH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Sir William Anson 1361

BAGNALSTOWN PETTY SESSIONS SUMMONSES.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1361

RECORDER'S COURT, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Atkinson ... 1362

BAGNALSTOWN WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1362

NEWBRIDGE ARTISANS' COTTAGES.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

INSPECTOR FLEMMING AND THE THOMASTOWN GUARDIANS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

BELFAST RE-VALUATION.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1363

RATING APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

TALLOW CONSPIRACY CASE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1364

IMPRISONED IRISH MEMBERS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1364

EDUCATION BILL—SHAM TRUST DEEDS.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1365

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1365

GIBRALTAR.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1365

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1366

NATIONAL FINANCE ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1367

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Managers)—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*)—brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 1367
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 1369
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs)... 1369
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1372
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1375
Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket) 1377
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 1378
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 1380
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1382
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 1385
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 1386
Mr. Moss (Denbighshire, E.) 1388

Nov. 19.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 554.)

Mr. Lloyd-George 1391

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, at the beginning, to insert the words 'Two of.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1394
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1396
Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) 1397
Sir Edward Grey 1398
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 1399
Mr. Trevelyan 1400
Lord Hugh Cecil 1401
Mr. Bryce 1402
The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 1404
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 1407
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 1410
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid*) 1412
Mr. Malcolm 1413
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 1414
Mr. Austin Taylor, (*Liverpool East Toxteth*) 1415
Sir Charles Dilke 1420

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 218. (Division List, No. 555.)

Mr. Alfred Hutton 1425

Amendment proposed,

"In line 1, after the word 'managers,' to insert the words 'of whom one shall be the parent of a child attending the school.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1426
Mr. Herbert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1426
Mr. Bryce 1427
Sir John Gorst 1427
Mr. George Whiteley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey*) 1428
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1428
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 1429

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 97; Noes, 210. (Division List No. 556.)

It being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

New Clause (Managers) :—

Mr. Lloyd-George 1433

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, after the word 'appointed,' to insert the words 'for a term of three years.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson 1434
Sir William Tomlinson (*Preston*) 1435

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 60 ; Noes, 117. (Division List, No. 557.)

Mr. Charles Allen (*Gloucestershire, Stroud*) 1437

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'deed,' to insert the words 'existing on the 1st day of January, 1902.'"—(*Mr. Charles Allen*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 1439
Mr. Ellis Griffith 1439
Mr. Platt-Higgins (*Salford, N.*) 1440
Mr. Samuel Evans 1440
Sir John Dorington (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 1442

Question put—

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 73 ; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 558.)

Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*)... 1445

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after 'school,' insert 'and shall be either residents in or on the register of voters (Parliamentary or County or Borough Council) for a parish within the school area.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1445
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 1446
Sir John Brunner 1447

Question put and negatived—

Mr. Herbert Lewis 1447

Amendment proposed—

"In line 5, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'Or the absolute control of the local education authority in all matters relating to secular instruction.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1447

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Edward Strachey .. 1448

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Channing ... 1448
Sir William Anson ... 1449
Dr. Macnamara ... 1449
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1449

Amendment proposed—

"In line 8, at the end of Sub-Section (1), to insert the words, 'Provided that in no case shall there be more than one priest, clerk in holy orders, or minister of religion, appointed as a foundation manager on the committee of management of any school.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Herbert Lewis... 1451
Mr Sydney Buxton... 1451
Sir Francis Powell... 1451
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) ... 1452
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) ... 1453
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 1453
Col. Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) ... 1456

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 88 ; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 559.)

Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1457

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'the local education authority or.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1459
Mr. Bryce ... 1459
Sir Francis Powell ... 1459
Sir John Brunner ... 1460
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1460
Mr. George Whiteley ... 1460
Mr. Samuel Evans... 1461
Dr. Macnamara ... 1461
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1461
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1462

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 70; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 560.)

Clause amended by inserting after the word "existing," in line 9, the word "owners."—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Mr. Herbert Lewis ... ...

Amendment proposed—

"In line 15, at the end, to insert the words, 'before such Order is made, reasonable notice thereof, with a copy of the draft Order, shall be given by the Board of Education to the local education authority.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1465
Sir Robert Finlay 1466

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Bryce 1466

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.—Order for Third Reading read. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Alfred Davies (Camarthen Boroughs) 1467
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1468

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXIV.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
SECOND YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 4th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time tomorrow.

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL.

Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Osborne Estate Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Leek; Whitby; Langholm; Kirkconnel; Thornlie Bank; Haworth; Felling; Rishton; and Pickering; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Haslingden; and Orkney; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Langholm; Leek; Kirkconnel; Haworth; Felling; Pickering; and Whitby; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Worcester; West Ilsley; Woodgreen; Southampton; and Warrington; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Dublin, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Leek; Langholm; Kirkconnel; Haworth; Felling; Rishton; Whitby; and Pickering; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Manchester; and Park Road; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE UNIONS.

Copy presented, of Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions in 1901, with Comparative Statistics for 1892–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Importation of Basic Slag.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that quantities of spurious basic slag have been imported recently into the United Kingdom; that a foreigner has been apprehended on a charge of alleged fraud in connection with these importations and committed to take his trial in London; whether he will watch these proceedings in the interest of his Department and take steps, and, if so, what steps, to prevent farmers being imposed upon by this article, sold as containing a percentage of phosphoric acid much in excess of the actual facts.

(*Answered by Mr. Hanbury.*) My attention has been directed to the case referred to in this Question, which apparently relates to a recent prosecution at the Mansion House in which an agent living in Brussels was charged with selling under a false warranty two cargoes of inferior basic slag. The defendant was committed for trial on the 3rd inst. I shall continue to watch this case. I have directed our inspectors' attention to the prosecution in order that they may bring the matter to the notice of the local authorities they visit, and have also communicated the particulars in our possession to the Irish Department of Agriculture, as it is understood that the greater portion of the consignments in question have been sold to dealers in that country.

Licensing Act, 1902—Police Assistance to Publicans.

MR. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, as promised, a circular pointing out to the police their duties in assisting publicans to keep the law has yet been issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I understand that the hon. Member has in mind a promise given by my right hon. friend, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, with special reference to Section 4 of the Licensing Act, 1902. In pursuance of that promise, I have inserted in one of the circulars which I am about to issue on the Act a paragraph pointing out that the police should of course continue to assist licence-holders in keeping the law by warning the person in charge of the premises if they see a drunken person entering them, and by helping, at the request of the licence-holder or his agent, to expel from the premises any person who is drunk, quarrelsome, or disorderly.

Sale of Old Brass Work from London Bridge.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he is aware that the whole of the cast bronze scroll work lamps on London Bridge are advertised for sale; whether these lamps were made from French guns captured during the Peninsular war: and, if so, whether he will consider the propriety of securing them for use in suitable places under the control of the Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) Inquiry shows that the lamps in question have been temporarily withdrawn from sale; so far as can be ascertained from the authorities concerned with the widening of the bridge, there is nothing to show that the lamps were made from French guns captured during the Peninsular war. The sale or retention of the lamps is a matter with which the City of London is concerned; the Office of Works has no jurisdiction whatever.

Naval Construction—Armour Plate Contracts.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether specifications have yet been issued for the armour required for any of the battleships or cruisers included within the programme of the current financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Specifications are being prepared for the armour which will be required for the battleships and cruisers included in the programme of the current financial year. Specifications will shortly be issued with tenders for the armour. No specifications for armour have yet been issued.

Ireland—Defaulting Tenants on the Dillon Estate.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any of the purchasing occupiers on the Dillon Estate have failed to pay instalments of their purchase money when due; and, if so, what proportion of the total number have so failed, and what action is being taken by the Congested Districts Board to recover the amounts so overdue.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) None of the tenants on this property, to whom advances have been made by the Land Commission for the purchase of their holdings, are in arrear with their payments to the Commission, except in two cases where the sum due, representing interest on the advances, amounts to 1s. 10d. The Question probably refers to the non-payment of the rent due to the Congested Districts Board. Out of the 4,191 tenants on the estate, the number who have not yet paid the rents and arrears due on 1st November, 1901, is ninety-seven. Proceedings are being taken in all these cases.

All Hallows Church, City—Union of Benefices Act.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the hon. Member for West Salford, as representing the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, whether the vacancy of All Hallows, Lombard Street, has been brought to his knowledge; and if the Commissioners will take steps to secure the appointment of the necessary Commission, under the Union of Benefices Act, to amalgamate one or more of the three parishes in Lombard Street within the City of London.

(*Answered by Mr. Lees Knowles.*) The initial proceedings under the Union of Benefices Act have to be taken by the Bishop of London. When the proposal, with the necessary assents, reaches the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, they will, I feel sure, do all in their power to facilitate an amalgamation.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Loans to Boers.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether loans granted to the Boers in the Harrismith district of South Africa are partly in money and partly in kind; if so, will he state what value is placed respectively on oxen and mules thus supplied; are the animals submitted to examination by a veterinary surgeon prior to the transaction being completed, and is a warranty given that they are sound.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have asked the Governor, by telegraph, for the information desired by the hon. Member, but have not yet received his reply.

Armour for New Cruisers.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when the orders for armour were placed and the manufacture commenced of the armour which was required for the armoured cruisers of the 1901 programme.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The armour for the six new armoured cruisers of the 1901-02 programme was provisionally ordered on the 12th August last, and the orders were confirmed on the 3rd September. The manufacture of the armour was immediately commenced by the armour plate makers.

India and the Government's Military Proposals.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is possible to circulate, before the discussion on the Indian Finance Accounts, either the whole or the earlier portion of the papers containing the observations of the Viceroy and the members of his Council on the military proposals of His Majesty's Government communicated to them and to the House of Commons in February last.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): I am afraid that the despatch I have been awaiting from India has not yet arrived, and until I get it, it would not be possible to publish the other Papers.

British Influence in the Yangtsze Valley.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the degree of influence now claimed by His Majesty's Government over the Yangtsze Valley.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The general position of His Majesty's Government with regard to the Yangtsze region has been often stated and has undergone no change. It seems scarcely possible or desirable to deal with the matter by means of Question and Answer. I propose, however, on an early date to lay Papers relating to the evacuation of Shanghai; the hon. Member will find in them information bearing upon the point which he has raised.

Metropolitan Police Perjury.

MR. HENRY J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state what other reasons, besides the use of unnecessary violence, induced the authorities to dismiss a second constable from the Metropolitan Police Force in connection with the case of ex-Constable Rolls; and whether the second constable was implicated in corroborating the false charge brought against Wheelerbread by ex-Constable Rolls.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The second constable, when questioned by his superior officers at the police station, corroborated Rolls in a statement which was afterwards proved to be false.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the fact that, under the International Scheme for North Sea Fisheries Investigation, the annual sum of £4,800 will be required for the maintenance of the central organisation of Copenhagen, and that Great Britain, Germany, and Russia will each contribute £1,250, and other countries £262 10s., will he indicate the names of these other countries; and will he state whether all the Powers, signatories of the North Sea Convention, were invited to contribute.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): It is proposed that £262 10s. towards the maintenance of the Central Fishery Organisation at Copenhagen shall be paid by Denmark, Holland, Sweden, Norway and Finland. The Powers who were parties to the Convention were Great Britain, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, France and the Netherlands. France and Belgium were not invited by Sweden to take part in the first Fishery Conference at Stockholm but have since been asked to participate in the investigations. I understand that France has declined the invitation, and Belgium has the matter under consideration.

Canadian Exports of Pig Iron and Steel.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state the rate of the bounty paid by Canada on the export of pig iron and steel, and the quantity of this bounty-fed iron and steel imported into this country during the last two years.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I know of no bounties on the export of Canadian pig iron and steel. Bounties are given on the production of pig iron and of steel ingots and puddled iron bars made from such pig iron. Up to April, 1902, the rates were $3 per ton of 2,000 lbs., except on pig iron produced from foreign ores which received $2. Between 1902 and 1907 the bounties are subject to continuous reduction, and the rates at present payable are 90 per cent. of those quoted above. The quantity of Canadian pig iron exported to this country in the years 1900–1901 was 1,603 tons. The corresponding total for 1901–1902 is provisionally stated as 100,519 tons. The Canadian accounts do not separately distinguish the exports either of steel ingots or puddled iron bars.

MR. LOUGH: Have the Government any intention of imposing countervailing duties for the protection of our manufactures against this bounty-fed iron and steel ?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

Workhouse Nursing Staffs.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Committee appointed to inquire into the differences alleged to exist between masters and matrons of English workhouses on the one hand, and the nursing staffs on the other, is still pursuing its investigations; has the inquiry concluded; and, if so, what is the result; if not concluded, can he say when it is likely to be brought to a close.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The Committee appointed by me with reference to the nursing of the sick poor in workhouses have concluded their inquiry, and I understand I shall receive their Report very shortly.

School Building Grants.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether any regulations, in addition to those contained in the Revised Code of 1870 and other Codes, have been made by the Education Department with respect to the use of schools which have been aided by building grants.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): By Regulations of the Board of Education such schools can only be transferred to School Boards under Section 23 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, and the Board of Education refuse to pay annual grants to a School Board on account of such a school till this condition has been satisfied. Under the same Regulations a School Board may not pay any consideration (whether price or rent) for a school so transferred, except a strictly nominal one. The Regulations in the Code of 1870, to which the hon. Member refers, relate to the conditions on which building grants were made and not to the use of schools aided by such grants.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: But are applicants for building grants required to give any undertaking to maintain the efficiency of the schools, and what provision is there for dealing with cases of failure to do so ?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The Regulations contain certain requirements as to the maintenance of efficiency. I have not them before me just now, but if the hon. Member will give notice I will obtain the information.

Highland Deer Forests—Glastullich Farm.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the greater part of the grazing farm of Glastullich, at Lochbroom, Ross-shire, is about to be added to the deer forest of Rhidorroch; and, in view of the extension of deer forests in the Highlands, will the Government consider the advisability of introducing legislation to prevent land suitable for occupation by the people being converted into deer forest.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The farm of Glastullich has lately been broken up and a large portion granted by the proprietor as an extension of holdings to five neighbouring crofter townships. The Secretary for Scotland has no reason to suppose that addition of the remainder to the deer forest of Rhidorrioch will prejudicially affect the economic condition of the district, and does not contemplate legislation in the direction suggested.

Scottish Congested Districts Return.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland will grant the Return on the Paper relative to congested districts (Scotland).[†]

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Secretary for Scotland would not be prepared to grant the Return in the form suggested by the hon. Member, which would offer difficulties in preparation, owing to many of the congested districts not being conterminous with parishes and for other reasons. If the hon. Member will inform me of his object in asking for the Return, I will consider whether it is possible substantially to meet his wishes.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a precisely similar Return was granted to an Irish Member now in gaol?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Illegal Trawling in Scottish Waters—Additional Cruisers.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, whether the Secretary for Scotland is now prepared to add to the number of cruisers at the disposal of the Scottish Fishery Board for the protection of the interests of the line fishermen against the operations of illegal trawlers.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The funds at the disposal of the Fishery Board do not at present admit of any addition to their fleet of cruisers.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Conservative candidate for Orkney and Shetland bitterly complains of the inadequate number of cruisers round the coast?

No answer was returned.

Colonel Finch's Coonagh Property.

*MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what steps have been taken to sell to the tenants, under the fortieth section of the Land Act of 1896, the property owned by Colonel Finch at Coonagh, near Limerick City; and in what state do the negotiations now stand.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Order of the Land Judge declaring the tenants of this property to be the purchasers of their holdings, was lodged with the Land Commission on Wednesday last. The sales will be closed in a few days.

Maintenance of the Deaf and Dumb in Ireland.

*MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the Report of the Royal Commission of 1888, to have the maintenance and education of the deaf and dumb and blind in Ireland made an Imperial charge, and not a tax on the Irish ratepayers.

[†] The Return was as follows:—Congested Districts (Scotland),—Return giving the population (1891 and 1901) and valuation, according to parishes, of the various districts scheduled as congested in Scotland, the Poor Rate assessment for each parish, and the number of tenants with rentals under £4, in the following form:—

County.	Parish.	Population, 1891.	Population, 1901.	Valuation.	Poor Rate in £.	Number of tenants with rentals under £4.

MR. WYNDHAM: I must refer to my reply to the similar Question addressed to me on the 10th July last by the hon. Member for the College Green Division of Dublin.†

MR. TULLY: But this is an original Question, and I do not claim any copyright in my Questions.

Dublin Custom House Steps—Begging by Nuns.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on pay days in Custom House, Dublin, nuns are allowed to go from desk to desk begging alms; and whether he intends putting a stop to the practice.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the alleged practice does not exist in any of the Departments located in the Custom House. It appears, however, that in the Department of the Collector of Customs the nuns of the Order of the Little Sisters of the Poor have visited the Office from time to time to receive alms voluntarily contributed to their charity, but that they have never solicited alms, nor have they acted in the manner suggested in the Question. I understand that an official formerly employed in this Department is at present under the care of these nuns.

MR. SLOAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the employees complain of this practice?

*MR. TULLY: When does the right hon. Gentleman propose to re-enact the penal laws in Ireland against priests and nuns?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of what the hon. Member for South Belfast alleges. I understand that there is no solicitation for alms.

MR. SLOAN: Then is the question to be left in its present position?

MR. WYNDHAM: As at present advised, I do not propose to intervene.

Monaghan Police.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of constables of the Royal Irish Constabulary doing town duty in Monaghan, and to what particular denomination do they separately belong.

MR. WYNDHAM: Eleven constables, of whom ten are Roman Catholics and one is a Protestant.

*MR. TULLY: Is it proposed to split up the barracks into religious compartments?

Irish Police and Freemasonry.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that District Inspector Tyson, of the Royal Irish Constabulary Depôt, recently delivered a speech to the men under his charge denouncing freemasonry; and whether such speeches from a public officer will be allowed in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. Tyson has been a freemason for thirty years. He made no such speech.

Irish Affairs—Nationalist Demand for a General Discussion.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now state if he is prepared to give a day for the discussion of Irish affairs, in view of the new circumstances which have arisen affecting that country.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No, Sir, I have nothing to add to the answer which I have given on several occasions to similar Questions.

MR. TULLY: I wish to bring back those poor "Exiles of Erin" to the Nationalist Benches. Last night there were more than enough outside on the shelf to defeat the Government, and I want to bring them back.

London Water Bill.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether it is worth while to continue printing every day the Amendments to the London Water

---

† See (4) *Debates* cx., 1378.

Bill, seeing that that measure is not to be taken until the Education Bill has passed through Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Very well, I will not put it down for the present.

MR. LOUGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman relieve our anxiety on the subject as soon as he can? It is a very troublesome question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot make it less troublesome.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 10:—

(2.30.) DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) moved an Amendment providing that the Board of Education should "without unnecessary delay" determine in case of dispute whether a school was necessary or not. He said he had taken the words which he proposed to insert from the Scottish Education Act, but he might remind the Committee that in the English Act of 1870 the phrase used was "with due despatch."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that on the preceding night an Amendment to which some hon. Members attached great importance—it was one in the name of the hon. Member for Liverpool, and dealt with the question of time—was excluded from discussion by the application of the closure. He thought it very essential that the House should have an opportunity of discussing and dividing upon the question.

DR. MACNAMARA said he had adopted the Scotch form, not because it was preferable, but because it seemed that anything in connection with the Scottish Act found greater favour in certain quarters.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'without unnecessary delay.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that surely the Committee were not going to insert words in an Act of Parliament which would suggest that a Government Department could be guilty of unnecessary delay.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Government Departments are.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he would have thought the word "forthwith" would have been sufficient.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) proposed to cancel all the words of the Clause after the statement that the Board of Education should, without unnecessary delay, determine in case of dispute whether a school was necessary or not. He said the Clause provided that the Board of Education should decide under such conditions that it was inconceivable that their decision should be other than favourable to the existing managers of schools or other persons, as against the local education authority. It was difficult in dealing with the Bill not to believe that the want of good faith so frequently disclosed was intentional; of course he was ready to recognise that the conditions imposed on the Board of Education were not really understood at the time they were inserted in the Clause, but as he had said, it was difficult to believe it, because when they came to consider the conditions one by one, they found that the hands of the Board were absolutely tied in coming to a conclusion between the local education authority and the managers. The first condition was that the Board of Education should have regard to the interest of secular instruction. That looked fair, but as a matter of fact, although the local education authority might urge that the interests of secular instruction would be damaged by a new non-provided school, the denominational managers would be able to contend that secular instruction would not be damaged by their school, as the local education authority had absolute control of secular instruction, and it was, therefore, immaterial from the point of view of secular instruction whether the new school was a voluntary or provided school. This first condition was, therefore, the merest pretence, and no one could conceive that the Board would, in such a case as he had suggested, give its decision in favour of the local education authority. The second point was that regard was to be paid to the wishes of the parents, who were the parties who were to go before the Board of Education. On the one side, they would have ten parents from the district served by the school put forward, probably by some society who paid their expenses, but who would speak at any rate as parents living in the district; while, on the other side, there would be the local education authority, with its head offices possibly forty miles away from the locality, and very likely the representative of the district on the authority unable to attend. Would not the judgment of the Board of Education on this point go in favour of the ten parents or the managers as against a local education authority whose contact with parish concerns, it could be argued, was less close, and who could not put forward any better argument than the general public convenience? The third and last condition alone was obviously sufficient to put the local education authority out of Court. It was that the Board was also to have regard to the economy of the rates. Once again, who were the parties to go before the Board of Education? On the one side, there was the local education authority which was to levy the rates for the building and maintenance of the school; on the other hand, the managers of the existing school, or ten parents who would come forward with the guarantee that they would find the building. It was clear that in that case there must be economy of rates, and the decision would go against the local authority. That was not all. The author of the Bill—and he could not believe that the First Lord of the Treasury had realised the fact—had put in a final sub-Section which still further limited the discretion of the Board of Education. It was to the effect that wherever a number of persons had built a school and got thirty children to attend it, the Board was bound to recognise the institution as a public elementary school, and the local education authority could not appeal against that, provided the school was actually in existence. The right of appeal was only given when the school building was not ready. The humour of the Clause did not end there. It would be observed that the subsequent Clause did not provide any penalty if the local education authority did not act in conformity with the orders of the Board of Education, and the managers or other persons were placed in this position: If they could build their school and get thirty children to attend it for the three months that were to elapse before any appeal was to be made to the Board of Education, the local education authority was at once put out of court. An Amendment had accordingly been put down giving the Board compulsory powers in the matter as against the local education authority, but not, he complained, as against the managers of an existing school or other persons. In practice the proposals of the Government would be used in certain districts to prevent the local education authority from doing its duty by making provision for elementary education in its area, while on those who objected, the managers of existing schools or other persons, there would be no enforcable duty of making good the deficiency.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 10, to leave out the words from the word 'not' to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the words from the word 'not,' to the first word 'to,' in line 12, stand part of the Clause."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman suffered from the malady which he observed had attacked a great many of the critics of the Bill, who thought it was some marvellously subtle contrivance devised by wicked and unscrupulous persons, who, under the cover of very plain and apparently innocent provisions, were really bringing into operation a marvellous engine for the destruction of all that hon. Gentlemen opposite held dear. The disease appeared to have attacked a large number of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and was a very vigorous and apparently infectious malady, but he really could not see that it ought to find an exciting cause in the words to which the hon. Gentleman objected. The hon. Gentleman thought these three provisions in Clause 10 at once so plausible and so wicked that only a surgical operation which would leave nothing but the first two lines of the Clause would satisfy him. They had laid down that the Board of Education, in determining a controversy as to whether a school was or was not necessary, should have regard to three conditions—the interest of secular instruction, the wishes of the parents as to the education of their children, and the economy of the rates. What other conditions could they possibly have put in? He was perfectly unable to understand the hon. Gentleman's point with regard to secular instruction. They heard yesterday speeches from many hon. Gentlemen opposite complaining that the provisions of the Bill would tend to the multiplication of small schools, and that this would be injurious to the interests of secular education. Now they had put into Clause 10 a provision that the Board of Education should have regard to the interests of secular education, and they were at once denounced as unscrupulous Machiavelian legislators. It appeared to him that they had attempted to meet, and had met, the very objection of which they heard so much yesterday, and the hon. Gentleman, in common consistency, ought now to support the Government. Why were they to imagine that the Board of Education were incapable of discovering what the general views might be in the district where a new school was to be erected? Why were they to assume that the inspectors sent down by the Board of Education would be incapable of discovering the general views of the district and of coming to a rational conclusion on this not very recondite matter? Then as to the provision that the Board of Education should have regard to the economy of the rates, he should have thought that was a condition that would have appealed to every hon. Gentleman on the other side. It was true it might be argued, with great and genuine force, that if the rates concerned were the rates of the whole area for which the local authority provided, that authority itself would be the best judge, until, at all events, a loan was asked for, and while the expenditure was merely out of the annual rates. But they were here concerned with a rate which fell, not on the education authority as a whole, and not on the whole area which the authority controlled, but probably with one that concerned only a relatively small portion of that area. It was quite fair, therefore, that the burden to be thrown on the ratepayers should be one of the considerations, though not the most important or vital, which ought not to be lost sight of by the Board of Education. It seemed to him that these conditions were not only desirable, but necessary. Their number certainly ought not to be diminished, for they covered the whole ground. The hon. Gentleman argued that, while a general power was given to the Education Department to compel the local authorities to do their duty under this Act and the Act of 1870, there was no corresponding power to compel the managers of voluntary schools to do their duty. He quite agreed that it would be an abuse if persons, while saying they were ready to build a school, and that what was wanted in the district was a school suited in the main to those of their own denomination, should defer from month to month, or from year to year, under cover of that perhaps perfectly just contention, the carrying out of an obligation which the interests of the district required should be carried out without any undue delay. He thought, however, that a provision in regard to this matter need not be inserted in an Act, as power already existed in the Department. He therefore submitted that the Clause as it stood was not open to the strictures of the hon. Gentleman.

(3.0.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) suggested that only the first two lines of the Clause, providing "that the Board of Education shall determine in case of dispute whether a school is necessary or not," were necessary; all the rest was verbiage. But it seemed to have been determined that the new education authority should have practically no voice in connection with any new schools. The County Councils, which were to conduct the education of the country, were being put into a position so contemptible and humiliating that he could not conceive any self-respecting body accepting the task upon such terms, and they could not be surprised if many of these bodies could not undertake the responsibility. Let the Committee look at the conditions in Clause 10. They had declared that the local education authority were to be supreme in respect of secular education. Supposing the local education authority said a new provided school was necessary for secular education, how were they to maintain secular education if that question was sent to the Board of Education to be determined against them? The same might be said of every one of these conditions. They would see that the local education authority were a miserable, subordinate body, who had to have the whole of their actions in secular education, in rates, and in everything else at the disposal of the Board of Education. His hon. and learned friend had taken some trouble to prove that these conditions would compel the Board of Education to determine against a provided school and in favour of a denominational school. He need not have been at that trouble. Those who had listened to the discussions and had seen the animus with which this Bill had been prepared might take it for granted that this matter would go to an arbitration in which the arbitrator had already decided. He confessed that the reference of this Section to the authors of the Bill, and those who would have to administer it, showed the way the decision was likely to go. The first thing was free secular education, and if there was any colour or pretence that the control of secular education was going to be given to the local education authority, the first condition must and ought to be that the decision as to new schools for secular education should be left to the local authority alone. It should not be over-ruled by any one who could say, "Our opinion is that denominational schools are better than provided schools for providing secular education." Consider the next condition, having regard to the wishes of the parents. One of the great merits of this Bill was that it was to be administered by the local authority. Who was the best judge of the wishes of the parents in a particular locality, the Board at Whitehall or the local authority? Who possessed the best means of judging? Why was the Board of Education at Whitehall to be a better judge of the wishes of the parents in a particular locality than the local education authority or the County Council? The County Council was put into a most contemptible position. They might be challenged on every point. They were not to be the people who were to judge whether a school was necessary or not in their own district. What would be the value of an educational authority which was not capable of forming an opinion as to whether a school was necessary or not? Then, with regard to the question of rates. Was the Secretary to the Board of Education a better judge of the question of rates than the local County Council or local education authority? It would surprise some local County Councils and Borough Councils to hear that. If the hon. Gentleman had to listen to two people, one of whom proposed to build a school without any charge to the rates and the other to build a school with a charge to the rates, he would of course always decide in favour of the school which was not to be a charge on the rates. If the hon. Gentleman had to go into the question of rates he could come to no other conclusion. The First Lord of the Treasury felt that somehow or other County Councils and Borough Councils had something to do with the rates. Whether that was a recent discovery on the part of the First Lord of the Treasury he did not know. The right hon. Gentleman had tried to get out of the stringency of that difficulty by saying that the charge on the rates for building the school would be a local charge; but that the charge for the maintenance of each of these schools would be a general charge; therefore his answer to that objection had utterly and entirely failed. Then, the last condition:

> "A school actually in existence shall not be considered unnecessary in which the number of scholars in average attendance as computed by the Board of Education is not less than thirty."

The Attorney General had interpreted that as meaning schools actually in existence at the time of the passing of the Act. But that was to include a school formed in the future. Anybody could get hold of a barn, which was what these schools were in old days, and get together thirty scholars.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said, first of all, sanction would have to be obtained under Clause 9, and after that, if the school was established, the attendance dwindled down to below thirty, it would be unnecessary.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Would it be a school actually in existence?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said, as he understood, the right hon. Gentleman was alluding to schools established after the passing of the Act. They could only be established under the sanction provided by Clause 9, and subject to inquiry, if demanded, by the Board of Education. If it passed that test, a school so set up would remain a necessary school so long as it contained thirty scholars.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said then "established" meant thirty scholars, and did not mean a school actually in existence. In future, when thirty scholars were got together there would be a power to compel County Councils and local education authorities to maintain the school. He did not know under the circumstances whether the powers placed in the County Councils under this Bill were such that they could conscientiously undertake to administer it. In the West Riding of Yorkshire the local authorities had already stated that they did not consider, under the conditions of the Bill, that they could conduct the education of the county. The Attorney General looked forward, with the ardour of his profession, to the *mandamus* with which he would be charged under this Bill. But the question went further. Why not *mandamus* the other party? There was no answer at all to that. The only penalty put into the Act was to withdraw the grant, but that did not prevent the obligation to maintain the school. The proposal was that the rates should be withdrawn as well.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said if the conditions were not observed the right of maintenance ceased.

Sir William Harcourt.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked how in the world were they going to *mandamus* one set of parties and not another? Were they not also persons who came under the law? Parliament ordered them to do a particular thing; if they did not do it the grant might be withdrawn. But if they were ordered to do a thing on these conditions, why were they not to be compelled to do it? It was not very important to labour the point, because he regarded the *mandamus* as a farce. If such powers were necessary the scheme of education would be at an end. He agreed with these Amendments. They were Amendments which determined the question of whether a school was necessary or not, and if the Government chose to say that a question of that kind should not be left with the education authority, then he ventured to say they would condemn the Bill, and that the education authority would be worthless for the purpose for which it was brought into being.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) supported the Amendment, because the words it proposed to omit were, in his opinion, absolutely unnecessary. Not only would some of the conditions not work, but they placed upon the Board of Education something in the nature of a direction which surely was not necessary in a body to be vested with judicial authority. The Board were to have regard to the interests of secular instruction. But the Clause concerned new schools, and it had already been provided that the local authority should have all control of secular instruction. What, then, was the use of repeating a provision already passed by the Committee? Then the Board were to have regard to the wishes of the parents. Where were they to find the parents of the children who might possibly attend a school not yet built? It was really ridiculous to make such a provision. As to having regard to the economy of the rates, who could tell better than the elected representatives of the ratepayers how money should be spent? And who, being elected by the ratepayers, would dare to waste the ratepayers' money? The best safeguard for the economy of the rates was the control of the ratepayers. The conditions were therefore absolutely unnecessary, and the desire of the Government would be secured by the words—

"The Board of Education should determine in case of dispute whether a school is necessary or not."

DR. MACNAMARA desired to enter a last, but, he feared, a futile, protest against this new-fangled scheme of providing school accommodation. He was a constitutionalist, and was unable to accommodate himself to the rapid and enormous changes the present "Constitutional Government" were making in this matter. In the past, the one ground on which additional accommodation had been provided was the existence of a deficiency of school places, and that was the only safe basis on which to go. The entirely new scheme now proposed was bound in the long run to be disastrous. The Board were to have regard to the interest of secular instruction. He did not understand that at all. Was it suggested that in a village there were to be provided several kinds of secular instruction? No one in his senses would imagine that a great variety of forms of secular instruction could be provided to meet special needs. He imagined that this new provision was simply their old friend "necessary or not" in another form. But if that was the case, why not say so? Then, the Board were to have regard to the wishes of the parents. That was all moonshine. If they had regard to the wishes of a persistent, but he was glad to say a small, minority of the parents in the matter of school accommodation, the authority would never provide any school at all. It was impossible to have regard to the wishes of the parents in that way. All that could be done was, after the necessary accommodation had been provided, to meet the needs of the parents, if practicable, with regard to religious instruction—perhaps under the Scottish system. The whole purport of the provision under discussion was to provide separate schools in response to the demand for different classes of religious instruction. Such a scheme was financially disastrous and educationally grotesque. Small schools could not be organised, the money of the ratepayers would be wasted, and the children would not get the education which they could get if they attended a comparatively large school. The third point was as to the economy of the rates. He was not particularly anxious about the rates. He would like to put the rates and theology on one side, and get on with the question of education pure and simple. But he viewed with some cynicism this provision coming from the Board of Education in the Homeland of the great British Empire. The recent declaration of the Premier of West Australia that as long as they had a single penny in their coffers they would spend it on the education of their people was in sharp contrast with this overwhelming desire for the economy of the rates. What would be said of a Secretary of State for War who, on finding the Army furnished with obsolete guns, refused to remedy the defect on the ground that regard must be had to the economy of the taxes? That was a perfectly parallel position, as national education was as much a line of national defence as the Army. The policy of the Clause was extremely short-sighted. A clear incentive was given to the use of denominational buildings wherever they existed, in order to relieve the locality of the capital charges for the building of a new school. The religious bodies of the country, having such buildings, had only to get the necessary attendance and claim to be put on the rates, and there for all time would be a school with the fetters of denominationalism around the education of the children. The clear intention of this provision was to secure that being done, and he protested against it. Apart from the existing parochial buildings, which with slight alterations could be used for schools, there were about £800,000 a year in voluntary subscriptions. At a generous estimate the repairs would cost £250,000, leaving over half a million of money at once applicable to the provision of buildings, which might be used for school purposes, and by instructing the Board to have regard to the economy of the rates, the Government were switching off education from the broad lines of nationalism to the narrow and devious ways of sectarianism. This new-fangled scheme of school accommodation being denominational rather than national, would be fatal to national progress and national education. The question of rate-aid, and popular control would settle itself, but this Clause fettered denominationalism of the narrowest kind around the education of the country, and therefore he strongly opposed it.

(3.27.) SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that the last time the Board of Education, of which he was a member, had to decide this question they decided it in the very way which the hon. Member for North Camberwell had described as impossible. In a village on the outskirts of Leeds there was a deficiency of school accommodation which the vicar wished to supply by building an additional voluntary school, and the School Board of Leeds by building a board school. The parish was a rich one, the rector was an extremely able educationalist, and, as far as the interests of education were concerned, there was nothing to choose between the two proposals. The sole ground on which the matter was decided was the wishes of the parents who would be served by the school. There was no difficulty in finding those parents, because they lived in the houses of the village in which the school was to be built. Inquiry was made and it was easily ascertained that the people wished to have a board school. That being the general opinion of the parents, the decision of the Board of Education was that the deficiency should be supplied by the School Board of Leeds, and not by the vicar.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said his strong objection to this proposal of the Government was that it tied the hands of the Department and hampered them in giving proper consideration as to whether a school ought to be provided or not. He gathered from the Prime Minister's speech that these three instructions were the obvious ones and exhausted all the instructions that could be given to the Department, and other matters could not arise. Surely all who had had experience of education questions knew that these three matters did not exhaust the instructions, and there were other matters which ought to be taken into consideration which would arise in the creation of a new school. The main question was whether the accommodation was required or not, and in taking that into account they should consider other things that might arise in connection with the matter. The right hon. Gentleman said the Opposition seemed to look upon these matters with grave suspicion, and for his own part he did look upon them with suspicion. None of the speeches from the other side had put forward any reason for leaving this matter to the discretion of the Department. The real reason for putting in this proviso was to give the Department an excuse for deciding in favour of denominational schools. The object of putting in these limitations seemed to be to hamper any future Government which might succeed the present Government in dealing with this question. He could not see any other grounds for this proposal and he strongly opposed it on the ground that in this matter the Education Department ought to have absolute and full discretion and should not be hampered in deciding what future accommodation ought to be provided.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that the one point of interest in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University was that he openly admitted that in the case he quoted the Department absolutely excluded the consideration of the economy of the rates, and had argued that, in this case, the Department had secured effectually a just solution of the wants of the locality by deciding the matter without taking that question into consideration. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman was thus one of the very strongest arguments for leaving the Board of Education an absolutely free hand and not restricting them by this requirement. He had regarded this Bill from beginning to end with a profound conviction that it was intended to supply unlimited funds and unrestricted power to the clerical party to enable them to get and keep in their hands the educational machinery of the country. They were now reduced to the ridiculous position, that this omnipotent authority, which was to re-organise the education of the country was to set about its duty bound hand and foot; and not only were they to have an equal balance given to the denominational competitors in regard to the right to make provision of schools, but when they came to arbitrate as to whether this authority was really to be entitled to provide schools for the community—the local education authority, which any one with aspirations for a national system would wish to see given the fullest right to provide, or their private sectarian competitors — then they had the Board of Education launched upon them with its hands and feet tied and fettered and limited by the restrictions the very absence of which they now knew had enabled the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University to perform not long ago an act of justice. These two Clauses completely fettered and paralysed the education authority. Then, again, he wish to put this question. Part of Section 18 of the Act of 1870 was embodied in this Bill, and the words included were—

> "That a School Board shall from time to time provide such additional school accommodation as is in their opinion necessary in order to supply a sufficient amount of public school accommodation for the district."

Yesterday, the Chairman in ruling certain Amendments out of order drew attention to the last paragraph of the Third Schedule which provided :—

> "The duty of a local education authority under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1902, to provide a sufficient amount of public school accommodation, shall include the duty to provide a sufficient amount of public school accommodation, without payment of fees, in every part of their area."

He wished to ask whether the limitations of these Clauses which restricted the powers of the local authority and of the Board of Education were consistent or inconsistent with the provisions he had just quoted to the Committee? It seemed to him that those provisions gave unrestricted power for the provision of future accommodation to the local education authority, and constituted a duty on their part to provide from time to time such accommodation, and especially of free places, as in their opinion was sufficient and necessary. These restrictions which were placed upon the local education authority, and upon the freedom of the Board of Education in acting as arbiter were an entire contradiction to the wording of the Bill. His hon. friend naturally took exception to the words at the end of the Clause, because there had been no explicit statement as to what sort of schools were contemplated. In a previous debate the Attorney General had said that a school must necessarily mean a public elementary school, but there was nothing in this Clause to justify that contention. It simply said, "a school actually in existence." It was perfectly essential that that point should be clearly defined before they could admit the justice of the right hon. Gentleman's contention. The Attorney General said that these schools must run the gauntlet of Clause 9.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Yes, the new schools.

*MR. CHANNING: Where was the difficulty in a rich company raising funds, and either using old buildings or building new schools, without giving any notice or applying to the local authority or the Board of Education and carrying those schools on for six months under the conditions laid down in the Act of 1870, for public elementary schools with a Conscience Clause time table and expressed willingness to receive an inspector, etc.? Where was there anything in the Act to prevent schools of that kind being run for a few months by private individuals or a company and then claiming to come in on the rates and compete with the schools of the local education authority? Such schools could come to the Education Department and say "We have an average attendance of more than thirty and we claim to be quartered permanently upon the rates and the grant list."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Under Clause 9, the Board of Education would have a controlling power as to whether such schools should be public elementary schools or not.

*MR. CHANNING contended that there was no difficulty in starting a school, for they could do this by inviting people to send thirty children. His point was that if any body of men were to do that, that school, according to the wording of this

Clause, would be entitled to say, "We are a public elementary school." Therefore they had to face this evil in its most naked and outrageous form. Practically by this Clause the sectarian demand to start schools was placed on an absolute level in the first place with the local authority, and after they had restricted the rights of the local authority, the Board of Education were prevented from judging with a free hand between the two parties. Finally the bogus and mushroom schools started all over the country might set up claims for permanent support from the rates. It was a disgrace to education and a disgrace to fair play as between one side and another in this matter.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) understood that the Government, in its allusion in this Clause to a "necessary school" only intended it to refer to a public elementary school, but according to the wording, it might equally refer to an unauthorised school. He was sure the Government did not wish the Clause to be ambiguous.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said there could be no harm in inserting "public elementary" before the word "school" but it was not necessary, because the only schools in regard to which that Clause had any force were public elementary schools.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE urged that the same thing occurred yesterday on a Clause. There was a misleading expression in that Clause, and he thought the Government would alter it, but when it came to the point they had no opportunity of amending it. The Committee should have a promise from the Government that they would introduce the words "public elementary."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY thought the words were already quite unnecessary, and if they were introduced in one place in this Clause and not in another earlier in the Clause it might leave in doubt as to what the meaning of "school" in the first instance was. The Clause began by saying that the Board of Education should determine whether a school was necessary or not. There the word was "school" and the question could only arise in the case of public elementary schools.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the word "school," at the beginning was not used in the same sense as at the end. At the beginning it was not a public elementary school that was referred to, and the Board of Education was deciding there whether a school should become a public elementary school.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I do not agree with that.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Board of Education was to determine whether a school had become a public elementary school or not.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that under Clause 8 the local education authority could say that a particular public elementary school was not necessary, and ensure that the word in Clause 10 related to the provision of new schools.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Attorney General had been good enough to refer to Clause 8. The first words of that Clause referred to a "public elementary school" and he thought it would be better that these words should be introduced here also. There was no kind of sliding scale in the considerations that were to determine the Board of Education in the decision of an appeal. Wishes of the parents, secular instruction, and economy of the rates—they were all placed on an equal footing. As to the last consideration, respecting the rates, there was no option. The decision must be in favour of the denominational school. As to the wishes of the parents, how were they going to be ascertained? Was there going to be a public inquiry, or was the clergyman to get up a petition and hand it in? The inspector who went down to inquire, as a rule, had preconceived notions with regard to these things. There were two different opinions with regard to education. One was, that the most important thing was secular instruction. The second was that of the gentleman who got up the petition; and they would say they did not want to give their children this dangerous weapon of reading and writing, as Canon Lyttleton had described it; what they wanted was to give them religious doctrine which taught them to be "humble and lowly to all their betters," and explained to them that their betters were the canons and prebendaries and curates of the Church. That was their opinion of education. A large number of these inspectors were clergymen themselves, and they were the very gentlemen who for years and years had tolerated insanitary dwellings, purely and simply in the interests of sectarian education. ["Oh, oh."] Was it not the case that those inspectors had the superintendence of the health and education of the children, and that they had done that in the interest of the denominational schools? [Cries of "Oh," and "Divide."] Hon. Members opposite were exceedingly impatient. When they were getting their Bill through at motor-car speed, surely they might tolerate a few regulations on the speed. Did they mean to say that the toleration of insanitary schools was not detrimental to education and to the health of the children? Did the law of the land tolerate them now? If it did not, why was it then that those inspectors did not report the insanitary condition of the schools to the Board of Education? It was because they were what was called imbued with a friendly sympathy with the voluntary schools. Those inspectors, imbued with a friendly sympathy with the voluntary schools, would go down to make this inquiry. They would not visit the parents; they would see the managers and the clergyman, and their report would be that in the interest of education, the wishes of the parents, and the rights of the existing denominational schools, a rival school should not be set up.

(4.3.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 203; Noes. 109. (Division List No. 468.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greville, Hon. Roland
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil

Maxwell,RtHnSirHE.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,WJ H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway,N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stewart,SirMark J.M‘Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.HonSir WilliamH
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,Sir CharlesG. E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt.Hon.Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon.Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir CharlesBenjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon.John William
Middlemore,John(Thr'gmort'n
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,Sir Chas. M.(Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest, J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gow'r
Toulmin, George
Warner,Thomas CourtenayT.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M‘Arthur.

(4.13.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word "to," in page 4, line 12, to the word "but," in line 14, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word "to," to page 4, line 12, to the word "but," in line 14, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 213; Noes. 108. (Division List No. 469.).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW(Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles,Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane,Hon.ThomasH.A.E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin EdwardBainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross,Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Saville
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland,SirFr'dDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Elliot,Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon.AilwynEdward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir RobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, Wliliam Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rHmlets
Gore,HnG.R.C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE W(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Grevillle, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Afred S.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier,Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon,Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W.(Salop)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton,Hon. FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell,WJH(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire
Morgan,DavidJ(Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donold Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley,Hn. M. W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stewart,SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC E H.(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)

Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(4.28.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 220; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 470.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dix'n
Dorington, Rt. Hon. SirJohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke,Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greville, Hon. Roland
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard,J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.

Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar(Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.JH(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay Francis Bingham
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C,E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashtonund.Lyne
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm.
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W.H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown,GeorgeM. (Edinburgh.)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight

Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swans'a
Kearley, Hudson E.

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accringt'n
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(4.40.) MR. CHANNING said the Amendment he now proposed to move was, he thought, one which the Government would accept. It did not seem to him that the definitions in the Bill would cover the assumption that the schools in this Clause would be public elementary schools. The Attorney General had once or twice stated that it was the intention of the Government that they should be public elementary schools having the Conscience Clause, and a time-table which allowed the parents to withdraw their children during the hours of religious teaching. He was not able to gather from the hon. and learned Gentleman whether his Amendment would be accepted, but he invited the hon. and learned Gentleman to give it careful consideration.

Amendment proposed, "In page 4, line 14, after the word 'a' to insert the words 'public elementary.'"—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought that there could be no objection to the insertion of these words if they were also inserted in the commencement of the Clause, but as they did not appear in the commencement they were quite unnecessary. They might have added the words in both cases, but they would only throw doubt on the construction of the Clause if the words were inserted in one place and not in the other. He hoped the hon. Member would rest content with that statement now. The matter might be brought up at a later stage.

MR. CHANNING thought the difficulty might be obviated by inserting the words "public elementary" in both cases. He would be quite willing to withdraw his Amendment now if he understood that the words would be inserted by the Government in both places on the Report stage.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he could not give any pledge as to the words being introduced. The matter would be considered, and he would be obliged if the hon. Gentleman would bring up the point on the Report stage.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs), in moving the substitution of "existing at the date of the passing of this Act" for "actually in existence," asked whether the words of the Clause meant in existence at the passing of the Act or existing at some time thereafter.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Clause would apply to every school existing at the time the question arose.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS thought in that case that the word "actually" was very much out of place. The object of the Amendment was to do something to check the enormous and unnecessary multiplication of schools which would inevitably take place if the Clause remained in its present form. The amplest safeguards for the managers of voluntary schools and the ratepayers had been already provided, and he could not conceive why it should be deemed necessary to take a large number of small schools entirely out of the discretion of the local education authority and the Board of Education as was here proposed. The provision was as uneducational as it could possibly be. It would lead to the multiplication of small schools necessarily weak in their teaching staff. The proposal was simply denominationalism *in excelsis*, and he was surprised the Government should have given their sanction to it. By schools being multiplied, as they undoubtedly would be under this provision, the education of the country would be rendered less efficient and more costly. Owing to the principles which had, unfortunately, been adopted in the Bill, it might be found necessary in some places and for protective purposes to establish additional schools, but he ventured to think the Government could have devised a more statesmanlike method of meeting the difficulty. It was to the interests of education and the general social interests of the community that the boys and girls in elementary schools should, as far as possible, grow up together in those schools, and not be separated into small divisions. In that way they would learn to know and respect one another better, and much bitter sectarian strife would be prevented. It would, doubtless, be said that the proposal was made for the sake of towns like Chester or Southport, where Nonconformists had no adequate representation in the schools, but the Government seemed to have adopted the policy of the Chinaman who burned down his house to roast his pig—because they were attempting to meet that grievance by a method which would result in the infliction of far greater educational and financial grievances. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 14, to leave out the words 'actually in existence,' in order to insert the words 'existing at the date of the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'actually in existence' stand part of the Clause."

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said the Government could not possibly accept an Amendment, which would stereotype the conditions existing at the time when this measure became law. With the rapid growth of population and the possible changes of denominational conditions, it would not be desirable to provide that this portion of the Clause should apply only to schools in existence at the passing of the Act. He agreed with the hon. Member as to the disastrous effect of the multiplication of small schools. Such schools should not be multiplied more than was absolutely necessary for the protection of the interests and the satisfaction of the desires of the different denominations. It had to be borne in mind, however, that the Clause referred not to the creation of new schools but to the continuance of schools actually in existence. When the question of the creation of a new school came before the Board of Education it would have to be decided according to the conditions already debated and passed, but the provision under discussion dealt only with schools actually in existence at the time the question as to whether a school was necessary or not arose. Suppose that a locality changed its denominational character and became very largely Jewish or Roman Catholic. That denomination might come forward with a proposal to provide a denominational school. Under the circumstances, and having paid regard to the matters already dealt with, the Board of Education might sanction a school of a denominational character, and there might be a withdrawal of children from a school provided by the local authority. That school, though depleted, should be allowed to continue even though the numbers were but little over thirty. For that reason it was desirable that the words should be allowed to remain as they stood, because they would prevent any injustice arising from the shifting of population and the change in the denominational character of the population. The continuance of the provision of schools varying in character was still of very great importance and necessity to many parents and children in the locality. For those reasons, on behalf of the Government, he could not accept the Amendment of his hon. friend.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he failed entirely to agree with the arguments which his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education had used in reply to the Amendment of his hon. friend.

*(5.5.)MR.ERNEST GRAY(West Ham, N.) said he could not agree with his hon. friend's defence of this Clause. The rule alluded to was in existence now, and it had not worked well at all. This proposal might mean one school entering into keen competition with another school, thus doing a great amount of injury to the education of the district What was the operation of this Clause? It tied the hands of the Board of Education. This was not a case of giving them larger powers and more discretion, for it was simply tying their hands behind their backs compelling them to say "Notwithstanding that we have declared for twelve months past that this school is absolutely unnecessary, that it is injurious, that it is not in the interests of secular education, and has no regard for the economy of the rates, yet, inasmuch as you have secured an average attendance of thirty scholars during a period of twelve months we have no option whatever." This might injure the education of the district and be wasteful; yet, notwithstanding this, the Education Department had to recognise that school and place it upon the grant list. Could any hon. Member say that this rule had worked well in the past? Had it not been the means of compelling the Board of Education to place schools upon the grant list which they had declared to be unnecessary. Take the illustration given by his hon. friend. He had perfect power to deal with a case of that kind. Take a case where there was a change of population. Take, for example, the town of Dover and its great harbour works. Through the introduction of a great alien population at Dover the necessity would arise for the erection of schools of various kinds. The Board of Education could admit a school of ten or exclude one of 500. The right hon. Gentleman proposed now to add not a new power but to place fetters upon them by saying that Parliament had laid down that this school, having scraped together for twelve months thirty children, was bound to be maintained by being placed upon the grant list, and so long as that school continued to give efficient education to thirty scholars they could not take it off the grant list. The right hon. Gentleman was throwing away his discretionary power in adopting those words. He begged the Government to reconsider the question of these small schools before the Report stage, and see if they could not leave the absolute unfettered discretion to the Board of Education and the local authorities, and not give away their powers by fettering themselves by an unnecessary Clause of this sort. He had supported the Government all through on these two Clauses, realising that until they reached this phrase the position of the Government was unassailable, but here they were placing a direct premium upon the erection of these small schools. It had been argued that the interests of the rates were entirely in favour of religious denominations. If they had two schools in one district accommodating thirty scholars each, when one school would accommodate the sixty, that was not in the interest of the rates or of secular instruction. Let them suppose that a Nonconformist clergyman, dissatisfied with the teaching of Church schools, manages to erect a school for thirty children, and keeps them together for twelve months, and came to the Board of Education for recognition. The Board of Education were bound to take over that school.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Not bound.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: They have to run the gauntlet of Clause 9.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY said that if at the end of twelve months such a school as he had described produced its register showing that thirty children had been in average attendance for twelve months it came within the terms of this Clause. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"] What was it then? Was there anything in the Bill which modified that procedure? Such a school would come up for an annual grant to be paid by the local authority, and as he read this Clause the Board of Education would then have no option whatever. They must take over that school of thirty scholars. He urged the Government to trust their own Department and leave them unfettered by any rigid rule of this discription. Let them take over schools of ten children if they thought it was desirable. He could imagine places in the Welsh valleys and in Cumberland and Westmoreland, where it might be found convenient to have a small school to prevent children having to tramp four or five miles, but he thought it should be left to the Board of Education quite unfettered, and they should not be compelled to take over any school of thirty whether they liked it or not.

DR. MACNAMARA desired to join in the appeal made by his hon. friend to the Government to accept this Amendment, or else to drop the last three or four lines of this Clause altogether. The Secretary to the Board of Education must recognise that this Bill was a great revolution in educational matters. Schools which were actually in existence should be dealt with fairly and honourably, but they should not allow denominationalists to come forward any time after the passing of this Bill, offering their buildings, and putting them upon the rates and grant list, thus forcing upon every locality for all time these denominational schools. Up to the present, the definition given them of an existing school had meant "a school in existence at the passing of the Act," but now they understood that it meant any time. Their greatest difficulty would arise in the small villages. The Church of England had its school in every village, and that school was now to be placed entirely upon the rates and taxes. There was great irritation already throughout the country upon this question. The people in a village would be able to say "Here is a building which we have no particular use for; we can get an average attendance of thirty, and we can have it put upon the grant list. He thought the Government proposal was highly objectionable, for the reasons urged by his hon. friend the Member for North West Ham. The Secretary to the Board of Education thought this difficulty would not arise, but the fact that they had a Church school established in every village would cause Nonconformists to turn every stone possible to find some means of having their own schools. All they had got to do was to bring forward the building at any date, and the Board of Education had no alternative but to say that the school was necessary, and the result must be that in many villages in Wales, and in Nonconformist districts generally there would be two schools each half empty, neither properly organised, extravagant to the locality, and educationally absurd. He appealed to the Government to drop all the words of the Clause after the word "but," or if they would not do that it should be so amended as to apply only to schools actually in existence at the passing of the Bill.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE supported the appeal of his hon. friend the Member for North West Ham to omit the concluding words of the Clause. In the first place these words would impose a quite unnecessary restriction upon the Board of Education; secondly, it might very well be a hardship on the ratepayers and the local authority to maintain schools which were in fact unnecessary; thirdly, it might be a serious injury to the Board of Education to be compelled to maintain unnecessary schools; and fourthly, it might cause a false standard of necessity to be set up. Moreover, he thought that the language of the Clause they were discussing was by no means clear. If the Government thought it necessary to give protection to the small schools actually in existence, they ought to accept the Amendment.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he had no idea that the Amendment was so important until he heard the speech of the Under Secretary. His speech was a direct invitation to every religious section of the community to try to obtain a little school with thirty scholars in it. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned two bodies not connected with the Church of England—Roman Catholics and the Jews. There were a dozen other Nonconformist bodies in this country; all of them, having regard to the invitation given them by the right hon. Gentleman, would undoubtedly set at once to try and provide their little schools. Schools of this size must be disastrous to educational efficiency and could only supply employment to teachers employed under Article 68. It would be impossible for schools of thirty scholars to engage and maintain an efficient teacher for so small a number of children. The Wesleyans had now raised a special fund of a million, and intended to devote a large portion of it to providing schools where necessary in order that the people of their faith might have a school in which their children should be taught their doctrines. If the Wesleyans in Lincolnshire, in Norfolk, in Cambridgeshire, in Cornwall, and in other counties where Wesleyanism was particularly strong, determined to have their denominational teaching at the public expense, and devoted a quarter of a million for the provision of the schools and their maintenance for one year, did the Prime Minister not see what the Clause would lead to? It would end disastrously to invite universal division in educational work. He should not have taken part in the debate but for the most alarming and revolutionary disastrous speech made by the right hon. Gentleman in his invitation. Swedenborgians, Plymouth Brethren, Congregationalists, Methodist Free Church, and a dozen other denominations would read his speech, and do their best to have their own little school and have it maintained out of public funds. It was only in the interests of sound and efficient education that the Amendment was moved.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said he only rose to correct an extraordinary misapprehension which the hon. Member for North West Ham appeared to be under. He appeared to think that under this Clause it would be possible for persons or bodies in some surreptitious way to foist a school on the community, and then to call on the local education authority to say that it should not be considered unnecessary, and that therefore there should be a school maintained unnecessarily at the public expense. The hon. Member seemed to have entirely forgotten what had over and over again been pointed out by the Attorney General, that we were dealing in this Clause with public elementary schools, and that the whole of Clause 9 dealt with the conditions under which public elementary schools could be established. Under that Clause, if the local authority, or any other persons, proposed to provide a new public elementary school they must get permission to do so. Where was the possibility of a little school being started with ten, fifteen or twenty children, suddenly sprung on the ratepayers, and established in that condition of permanence such as the hon. Member feared? He did hope that hon. Members would not cherish the superstition that these schools spring up unobserved and would be suddenly thrown upon the ratepayers.

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said the debate had clearly shown that either the Clause was not so readily intelligible as hon. Members who had spoken for the Government seemed to suppose, or some Members of the Committee on both sides of the House were more than usually stupid. The Parliamentary Secretary had been good enough to call them superstitious, but he thought that the Clause did really seem obscure. He frankly admitted that he had had considerable difficulty in understanding it. He did not realise that the word "school," where it was first used at the beginning of the Clause did not refer to a new school. He did not see why the Clause should not be made clear as it stood. He thought the best thing by far would be to trust the Board of Education, and to omit those lines altogether. It would not mean that the Government were giving up anything they were contending for. It would only be giving a little more discretion to the Board of Education. If the Government could not take that course, he would suggest that they should take the course suggested by his hon. friend, and, at any rate, prescribe to the Board of Education that those proposing to provide a new school should comply with certain regulations. But if the Government would not have either of these courses, he would ask them to make it clear in the Bill, so that people, not having the advantage of explanations from the Attorney General, could rightly understand the meaning. The hon. Member for North West Ham had expressed himself in doubt as to what a school "actually in existence" might mean. He understood the Government contention to be that a school recognised as necessary no wand receiving a grant should not be considered unnecessary in future if it had thirty scholars.

(5.28.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought it should not be difficult to understand the Clause. No new school could be called into existence without due notice, full inquiry, and the sanction of the Board of Education. Therefore, every school in existence would be a necessary school. Suppose a rate-provided school was established. For some reason or another the circumstances of the district slowly changed, and there was a strong desire for a denominational school. Permission was granted for that school, and it emptied the rate-provided school of pupils whose parents preferred denominational teaching. Precisely the same thing would happen in a converse case. Suppose there was a rate-provided school started in competition with, or in the neighbourhood of the denominational school, a large number of pupils might prefer the teaching of the denominational school, and it was quite clear that it would be a burden to maintain both schools. It was evident they could not deal with machinery below a certain point. They wished that every child should have the teaching which the parents would like to give it, but there were limits, and they could not consider all the claims of that kind even with existing schools. The point was at what particular number they were to fix the limit at which the school was to cease to have a claim to public support. How far were they going to allow the process of depletion to go on so as to beat a school out of the educational ground. The number thirty had been fixed upon—a number they found buried in the Act of 1870. There was, therefore, Parliamentary sanction for it, and it seemed a reasonable number; but let it be understood at what stage they were going to kill an existing school.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said that the words were really not clear; they were incorporated from another document which had no reference to the case before the Committee now. But the Clause, as it stood, also covered the position already covered by the words of the Code. On the formation of a school, and its having obtained thirty scholars, was the Board of Education to recognise it or not? He was afraid they might all read a different interpretation of the words in the Clause. What was wanted was that the words should be made so clear that there would be only one interpretation.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that that was the point which he strongly supported. The sort of change he wanted was to strike out the words "actually in existence" and to substitute the words "a school which has once been recognised as a public elementary school."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would be quite prepared to accept that.

MR. DUKE (Plymouth) thought the words "a school once already recognised" had no definite meaning, but there was a form of words which would get rid of the difficulty. He suggested "a school actually in existence at the passing of this Act, or hereafter to be provided under Section 9." [Cries of "No, no."]

MR. M'KENNA said that Article 80 in the Code stated "A school is not to be deemed unnecessary if at the date of the application for an annual grant it is recognised as a certified efficient school and has an average attendance of thirty scholars." He thought the insertion of these two words, "certified efficient," before school would meet the difficulty.

MR. BRYCE suggested that the words should be "a school once recognised as entitled to maintenance."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not agree that the words of the Prime Minister fairly covered the case, and they should be subject to the most careful scrutiny.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Committee would do well to get at the form of the Amendment; he proposed therefore, to accept it in the following shape—"A school already recognised as a public elementary school." He said he did so subject to careful consideration as to the drafting. There could be no mistake as to the policy of the Government on the point of principle.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment made—

"In page 4, line 14, by leaving out the words, 'actually in existence,' and inserting the words, 'already recognised as a public elementary school.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) said he did not wish to raise any lengthy discussion on his Amendment, to leave out the word "thirty" at the end of the Clause and insert "hundred." The Prime Minister had very justly observed that on any Clause of this kind arguments might be used either for increasing or diminishing the number, and he had indicated that the limitation of 30 occurred in the Code under the Act of 1870. But he submitted to the right hon. Gentleman that whatever might have been adopted with propriety in 1870 was too small a number under a new administration. The First Lord had enlarged on the rights of parents, and had stated throughout that his object was, as far as possible, to secure equality by giving all parents the opportunity of getting a school in which the doctrines of their faith would be taught to their children. For himself he would have much preferred if the Bill had dealt with the new schools to be provided by the local education authority, without raising the question of existing voluntary schools. He maintained that 30 was much too limited a number and he did not propose 100 as better than 110, but because he thought it would be more convenient. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 17, to leave out the word 'thirty,' and insert the words 'one hundred.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed' "That the word "thirty' stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the hon. Gentleman had put his argument very fairly. After all, however, the question was, what was a suitable number. He submitted that 100 was distinctly too large. If there were 30 it showed that there was a sensible demand for a school. He would point out that the Clause did not say that 30 was a hard and fast limit. It was possible for a school already recognised to have a smaller number of scholars. But so long as it retained 30 it would not be struck off the list if it had once got on.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he understood that the limit of 30 had been adopted from the Code following the Act of 1870, but the circumstances now were very different from those when that Code was drawn up. He understood from the Attorney General that the Clause might be extended by the Board of Education to schools with only ten or twelve children.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) appealed to the Government to give a little consideration to this matter. His hon. friend who moved the Amendment had, he thought, gone to the other extreme by fixing the limit at 100, but a school with only 30 children, or even less, meant necessarily a very inefficient school. It was impossible for one teacher to teach children from the age of three to the age of thirteen, and from Standard I. up to Standard VII. At an earlier stage he had made a suggestion which would get over the inefficiency of small schools. In America they had adopted a system of amalgamating small schools and providing public conveyances to carry the children to the consolidated school when it was at too great a distance for them to walk. The inspectors of the American Education Department had reported how very great was the increase of efficiency by adopting a system of that kind. If such a scheme were adopted here no obstinate body of managers who preferred their own school could block the way to educational reform in the small schools. He appealed, in the cause of good education, to the Secretary to the Education Department to give them some encouragement and, if the hon. Gentleman could not agree to fix the number at 100 to accept 50 or 60. He was sorry the right hon. Member for Cambridge University was not in the House, because he knew that that right hon. Gentleman held the same views as he did on this question and had often expressed them.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said it seemed that this question had been considerably altered by the change of language adopted by the Government, because they had accepted the words "already recognised." The number 30 had been accepted by Parliament in the Code for thirty years, and it would be, he thought, a hardship on many schools to alter it. The point he wished to emphasise was that these schools would not be recognised and receive the grants unless they were efficient. He himself was by no means a friend of the small schools, and he had visited many of them; but at the same time, in many thinly populated districts, the children could only receive education in small schools, and there they were necessary. He thought it would be an act of injustice to abolish these small schools.

MR. BRYCE said that the argument of his hon. friend who had just sat down had been entirely nullified by the statement of the Attorney General, who had admitted that schools with only ten or twelve children ought to be maintained.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: In special circumstances.

MR. BRYCE: Yes, in special circumstances. The reason why they objected to 30 was that that number would prove an obstacle to consolidation. Small schools might be efficient in the sense to be entitled to receive a grant, and yet they might be far less efficient and be far less able to serve a district effectively than one large, strong school, but the *amour propre* of the managers might induce them to resist consolidation of the weaker schools. If they were to fix a limit it should be much higher than 30, say 60 or 70. If his hon. friend persisted in his Amendment he ought to be supported.

*MR. CHANNING said that it had escaped the attention of hon. Members that sub-Section 2 of Clause 19 in the Act of 1870, which enabled State grants to be made to small schools where the number of children was smaller than that mentioned by the Attorney General, was not repealed by this Bill, and therefore the Board of Education would be enabled to authorise grants to these very small schools where they were necessary. He should leave the question of the limit of numbers to be absolutely elastic. He entered a protest against the insertion of any words in the Bill which would seem to raise unnecessary difficulties to the process of consolidation. He had paid many visits to the United States and had on every occasion studied the working of the school system there. The extraordinary thing was that in the most progressive State, Massachusetts, despite the great advances made by education, the total number of public elementary schools had actually diminished during the last ten years. That had been done by deliberate Act of the Legislature and the local authorities. The number of small and usually inefficient schools had been limited, and splendid buildings erected with many class-rooms, with the best possible staff and facilities for pupils being passed on to higher studies, a policy which enabled the children to obtain educational advantages which they could not have commanded in very small schools. He would much prefer if his hon. friend withdrew his Amendment limiting the number of children, or add to his Amendment words of a nature to convey what was in the minds of everyone who had considered this question, as, for instance, "or such other number as is, in the opinion of the Board of Education, consistent with efficiency of education in the district to be served." He hoped, in any case that in the administration of this Bill, if it passed into law, which he certainly hoped it would not, the hon. Gentleman who was now Secretary to the Board of Education would not encourage this fatal policy of multiplying small schools, or discourage in any way the consolidation of weak and inefficient schools into large, strong, and efficient schools.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said that so far the matter had been considered on the lines of rural schools. It was not alone a matter of rural schools, but a matter of how to deal with denominational schools in urban areas. In the area of Liverpool there were about twice as many voluntary schools as board schools, but less than half the children in that area were educated in them. The voluntary schools there were practically less than half the size of the board schools, school for school. In the parishes of a county city like Liverpool there would sure to be a school in connection with each parish church, and in areas of this character, where the parishes were close together and did not each occupy a large space, he thought where the two voluntary schools were in close proximity, one with a large building half empty and the other with a small building quite full, the local education authority should have power to bring all the children to the large school and close the small one. In that case there would be one large school where education would be more economically and efficiently carried on. No harm would be done to the denominations in the city, but there would be a great gain to education. If the proposal of the Clause as it was held good it would be in the power of the managers of a small school like this to insist upon their school remaining on the grant list and being maintained so long as there were thirty children in it. In rural areas the difficulties of distance and thinness of population no doubt justified the number of thirty, but in urban areas the number ought not to be maintained. Every Member of the House would feel that the question of putting new burdens on the ratepayers for denominational schools ought to be considered from an economical as well as a political point of view. At present it had not been considered from that point of view.

(6.3.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 230; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 471.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. HnJ. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, SirT. R. (TowerHamlets
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyny
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirEW (B'ryS Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles, Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick. Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt, Hn, Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbt. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir Wm. Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Camarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, HenryJ. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse,SirJ T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Brynmor Jones and
Mr. Herbert Roberts.

(6.18.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question, 'That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 244; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 472.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles,Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown,Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson,Rt.Hon. Sir Edward H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbysh're
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohn Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,SirT.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland,SirFr'd Dixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon. Sir JohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson,SirAugustus Frederick
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon. S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ry SEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury,Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon.Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky,Rt.Hn. WilliamEdw.H.
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire

Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J'hn Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (D'rh
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway

White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(6.33.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 473.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Hn'ry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hon J A (Glasg'w
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Charles Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn. G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Jos'ph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. A.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S. Forde(BethnalGreen)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stewart,Sir MarkJ.M‘Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webb, Col. William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn,E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Asquith,RtHn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davis, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt HnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Gl'morgan,Gower
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Warner,Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse,Sir J T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M‘Arthur.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 11 :—

(6.48.) **Mr. LOUGH** (Islington, W.) moved to insert after "authority," in line 1, the words, "or any body of managers." He said the object of the Clause was to give the Board of Education the power of compelling the local education authority to carry out its duties. He thought other bodies on whose shoulders responsibilities rested should also be compelled to do their part.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think it will do to propose such an Amendment here. That matter has already been discussed on Clause 8, sub-Section (*a*), and if the managers fail to carry out their duties under this Act certain things are to happen. The Committee have considered that case and laid down what is to happen.

MR. LOUGH: I am thinking specially of Section 9.

MR. M'KENNA said that if any persons other than the local education authority proposed to provide a new public elementary school and failed to carry out their proposal, the Board of Education should have power to compel them to do so. The Amendment was therefore in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What does that matter? I understand that other persons can come forward and say that they are prepared to provide a new school, but that is not a duty under the Elementary Education Acts. Therefore it would not be right to insert these words in the way proposed. I do not say the proposal of the hon. Member is not a proper one to make; far from it. What I say is that you cannot assume that persons other than the local education authority have certain duties under the Elementary Education Acts. Of course they have not.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that under Clause 8 certain consequences were to follow if the managers did not perform their duties, but did that exclude their being subject to another penalty? The local education authority were subject to *mandamus.*

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that a *mandamus* was not given as a remedy if there existed another remedy. Under Clause 8, if the managers failed to discharge their duties, the local education authority were, in addition to their other powers, to have power to carry out the original intention as if they were managers.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) submitted that it would be very much more convenient if the managers carried out the duty under *mandamus* than if the local authority did it.

MR. LOUGH said the words he proposed to insert would make the Clause clearer.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY submitted that the hon. Member was not entitled to bring in the words here with reference to Clause 9, which was perfectly explicit. If the managers did not carry out their undertaking to provide a school the Board of Education might require them to do it, but that would rest between them and the Board.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved an Amendment, with the object of making it quite clear that failure on the part of the local authority to provide the necessary additional school accommodation was to be brought under the sanction of a *mandamus*, which was to issue if the local authority in any respect failed in its duty. It would be impossible for the Board of Education to come down upon a County Council and say that they proposed to substitute persons of their own nomination for the purpose of providing the elementary school accommodation which the area required, and so this failure to provide school accommodation must, in correspondence with other failures by the local authority, be brought under the sanction of a *mandamus.*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or fail to provide such additional public school accommodation as is in the opinion of the Board of Education necessary.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

(7.0.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said it would be interesting if the Attorney General would give the Committee information as to what was going to happen under a *mandamus*. If the County Councils were not to be the judges of what accommodation was required for secular education it was possible, indeed it was highly probable, that some of the Councils would say that they would not apply the rates to the purposes which formed the subject of a *mandamus*. That would be dealing with the rates in a manner which he thought would be disadvantageous to education. Of course the promoter, who might be called the executive officer, would be the Secretary to the Board of Education. He really thought that these great local education authorities should be warned beforehand, so that they might understand how the Secretary in London was going to prosecute them and for what. Was the Attorney General going to prosecute them in cases where they appropriated the rates in a manner which they thought would be advantageous to the ratepayers? He thought that all that should be made clear before *mandamus*.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the procedure by *mandamus*, where local authorities were concerned, was quite clear. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that there was a procedure of *mandamus* in the Public Health Act by which the local authority was, for instance, compelled to carry out a scheme of drainage. The *modus operandi* was this. Those members of a local authority who refused to perform their statutory duties were liable to be proceeded against; and if they disputed the *mandamus*, then it might be enforced against their person and property. The remedy was against those who were guilty of disregarding the injunction which was laid upon them. He did not in the slightest degree agree with the observation of the right hon. Gentleman as to the position of the local authority in the Bill.

DR. MACNAMARA said that this was a very necessary matter, but it seemed to him that there was some little conflict between the Clause proposed by the Secretary to the Board of Education and Section 18 of the Act of 1870. The Clause said that if the local education authority failed to fulfil any of their duties, etc., the Board of Education might, after holding a public inquiry, make such order as they thought necessary, etc. But the Act of 1870 said that the Board of Education was only to proceed if the School Board "failed from time to time" to provide such additional accommodation as was necessary. In order that there might not be conflicts in the courts of law the Attorney General should consider whether the words unrepealed under the Act of 1870 should not be struck out.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he thought that the effect of the words in the Clause would be to over-ride the Section of the Act of 1870 referred to by the hon. Gentleman, but the point would be fully considered, and, if it was found desirable to modify the Clause, that could be done at a later stage.

MR. M'KENNA said he wished to move as an Amendment to the Amendment the insertion after the word "authority" of the words, "or other persons mentioned in Section 9." By Clause 9, not only the education authority, but "any other persons" might propose to provide a new public elementary school. By the Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education, the Department would have power to compel the local authority to provide the school if they failed in that duty, but there was no power to compel those "other persons" to carry out their proposal. Other persons ought not to be allowed to come up and offer to provide a school, and having stopped the local authority from carrying their scheme, to say six months afterwards, "We are sorry we have not found the money and cannot go on with our proposed school." He maintained that if the Board of Education, having determined that a proposed new school was necessary, and those other persons having defeated the local authority, they should be compelled to carry out their proposal.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'or,' to insert the words, 'if the local education authority or other persons under Section 9.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the Amendment was not one that could possibly be accepted. It was barely intelligible, and even if it were capable of being understood at all, it would not be flattering to the intelligence of the Committee if they adopted it.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Committee had got into trouble because they had been closured last night, and again today. The great danger of Clause 9 was that there would be paper promises which would prevent the real operation of the Section. These paper undertakings would not be kept. The proper way of dealing with the point was by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool, the discussion of which was stopped by the closure. It could not be raised again now, and therefore they were forced to try and adopt a less desirable Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Amendment of the Government dealt with those who failed to provide sufficient accommodation. If the local authority failed to provide sufficient accommodation they were to be punished, but if the managers proposed to afford additional accommodation in their own schools, and failed, they were let go scot-free. It was assumed that the managers had no duties, only privileges. They could compel the authority to give them the rates and Parliamentary grants, but the moment they came to the local authority or the Board of Education it as said that they had no reciprocal duty at all. What his hon. friend proposed was that if the Board of Education directed that the managers should increase the school accommodation, and make it more satisfactory, and they refused to carry out that order, they should be subject to the same liability as the local education authority. If the local education authority refused to carry out the direction of the Board of Education they could be sent to Holloway gaol. Why not those other persons, the managers? Why should not they *mandamus* the clergyman of the parish? It was because he was a privileged person. This was another illustration of the way in which one section was favoured at the expense of another. How could hon. Members defend this discrimination between the denominational managers and the local authority? If the managers had duties under the Act, why should they not be compelled to perform them? The only answer was that they could withdraw the grants and close the denominational schools. But they could also withdraw the grants and close the schools of the local authority, and why should not that be sufficient for the latter as well as for the former? There was one law for the sectarian school, and another for the local authority; *mandamus* for representatives of the people, Holloway prison for the County Council, but none for the clerical manager. He objected to this and to the whole thing, because he maintained that the principle was bad to discriminate in favour of a privileged sect rather than in favour of the ratepayers.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said he thought it was due to the Committee that the Attorney General should tell them if he would either now, or in some other place, provide against the danger which had been shown by his hon. friend to exist. The difficulty described by the hon. Member for North Camberwell was a real one, and a hindrance to the progress of education.

(7.18.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 243. (Division List, No. 474.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John

Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Priestly, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C R. (Northants)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glam'rgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. M‘Kenna and Mr. Brynmor Jones

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Faber, George Denison (York
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Hardy,Laurence(Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard,J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon,Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lecky,Rt.Hn.William Edw.H
Lee,Arthur H(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W(Eversh'm
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,WJ H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,Rt. Hn.Sir Frederick G
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan,David J (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt Hn A Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon.M.W (Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hn.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S.(Limehouse)
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanark)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spencer, Sir E. (W.Bromwich
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
TalbotRt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd.Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC EH(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webb,Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Welby,Sir Charles G. E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams,RtHnJ Powell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C. B Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W.H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY — MOTION TO SET UP COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER VOTE FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

(9.0.) THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): In moving that the House do tomorrow, at 9 o'clock, resolve itself into Committee of Supply, it is my duty to inform the House, as a Minister of the Crown, that exceptional circumstances have arisen which render it necessary for the Crown to apply to the House for a further grant in Committee of Supply, to the amount of eight millions, the Estimates for which I have laid on the Table of the House. As the House will no doubt know, the proposal which I make is one of a very exceptional character, and can only be justified by very exceptional circumstances. The exceptional circumstances which have arisen, calling for this exceptional proceeding on our part, are connected with the terms of surrender which were arranged at the conclusion of the war with the Boer leaders. One of these terms was that there should be an amount of three millions sterling given to the Boers for purposes of repatriation and certain other purposes named in the terms of surrender. Now, I think it may be very fairly said in regard to this matter, why—if this was so—was not a Vote for the purpose proposed at the ordinary time when the Estimates were taken, before Committee of Supply was closed, and before the Appropriation Bill was introduced? Well, the reason why we did not propose this Vote at that time I will shortly state to the House. It was understood by his Majesty's Government, when these conditions were arranged, that this grant of three millions of money was not to be given out of the Imperial Exchequer, but that it should be part of any Transvaal loan which should be floated on behalf of South Africa; and, of course, if that view had been so, there would have been no necessity at all for applying to Parliament for any grant; it would, of course, have been met out of the loan when that loan was put upon the market. But, while the Government hold that that would have been a carrying out of the agreement with the Boers, still we had to consider views placed before us in connection with the matter by the Boer leaders, and it was urged upon us that this would not be a compliance with the spirit, at any rate, of the terms which had been agreed upon at the time of surrender. It was urged, and I think not without force, that a free gift by His Majesty's Government meant that the money would be found, not out of the Transvaal revenue, but out of the revenue of the United Kingdom. Well, as I have said, we considered the matter, and arrived at the conclusion that this particular item of the conditions did undoubtedly lend itself to some extent to that contention on behalf of the Boers, although I still maintain that the understanding at the time of the arrangement was that the money should be found out of the Transvaal loan. Well, that was the position of things when I assumed the office I have the honour to hold. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government had to consider what course they should adopt, and the House will see that one thing incumbent on us was to avoid, if possible, any legitimate feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of those who had been our enemies. The worst thing that could happen would be to give them a legitimate grievance, to give them any solid ground for the contention that we had got them to agree to terms of surrender under false pretences, or that, having agreed to terms of surrender, we had interpreted those terms in the sense most favourable to ourselves and least favourable to the Boers. This would have been a grave risk to run, and a risk which His Majesty's Government did not feel themselves called upon to run. We believe we are acting most in accord with the interests of South Africa, most in accord with the feelings of the people of this country, and, I believe, with the feeling of the House, in taking this burden on ourselves.

That being so, the matter could no longer be disposed of in the way we originally proposed—namely, by taking this money out of the loan which was to be floated on behalf of the Transvaal; and it is therefore necessary for us to come to Parliament to ask Parliament to authorise us to pay out of the revenues of this kingdom the amount of three millions which we have undertaken to give to the Boers, and, although it formed no part of the terms of surrender, we propose to treat the loyalists of South Africa in a similar manner. I am sure the House would certainly not be satisfied with any arrangement by which the Boers were to receive a considerable sum for repatriation and other matters under the terms of surrender, and the loyalists would not receive a corresponding advantage. After consideration, we have come to the conclusion to appropriate to the loyalists two millions in a similar manner, and that this will meet the justice of the case. It therefore follows that, if a free gift should come out of the revenue for the Boers, then the two millions for the loyalists should also come from the revenues of the United Kingdom. Therefore we have to come to the House now, and ask it to go into Committee of Supply for the purpose of enabling us to pay over for repatriation and other kindred purposes three millions to the Boers and two millions to the loyalists. But, in addition to this, one of the terms of surrender was that a certain sum should be advanced at a low rate of interest for similar purposes, and we have estimated that sum at three millions. That sum is a sum to come legitimately out of the Transvaal loan when it is put upon the market, but until that loan is put upon the market we have to find the money for this purpose, and this sum is also included in the Vote we shall ask the House to consider tomorrow. But that will not form any permanent obligation on the British Treasury; it will be merely an advance out of the balances of the Treasury to be repaid to the balances when the Transvaal loan is floated.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): A loan for the Transvaal and the Orange Colony?

*MR. RITCHIE: Oh, yes; where I have spoken of the Transvaal I must ask the House to take it that I also include the Orange River Colony. I may say in regard to this incidentally that the reason why we ask the House to go into Committee of Supply to vote the money which will be repaid is because we consider that the present time is not a good time for floating a Transvaal loan; we hope and believe that in the Spring there will be a much more favourable opportunity. Therefore, in the Vote we shall ask the House to consider we include this advance to the Transvaal and Orange Colony. Now, my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn, with whom on matters of this kind I always differ with great hesitation, because I know he makes a special study of matters of procedure, says:—This may be all very well; it may be quite right to do what you intend, but you are not adopting the proper mode of procedure. It is an unprecedented thing, or almost unprecedented, at any rate it has not occurred for 150 years, that the House of Commons has been asked after Supply is closed, and after the passing of the Appropriation Bill, to go into Committee of Supply for a purpose of this kind. Committee of Supply, he says, being once closed ought not to be re-opened by subsequent procedure such as we adopt. There has been no precedent for any such proposal for the last 150 years. I confess I think we shall be able to show, in justification of this procedure, that the circumstances are very exceptional. The present position of the House is exceptional. I do not think that such a combination of exceptional circumstances has arisen in the last 150 years. This House has met for an Autumn Sitting, and there has been an exceptional demand by the Crown for a grant of money. I contend that these exceptional circumstances justify the procedure I now ask the House to adopt. One thing, undoubtedly, is necessary in matters of this kind, and that is that, whatever funds may be thought to be necessary, all grants of money ought to be based on a request from the Crown. I have made it my business to make inquiries upon this matter, and I feel sure that, having in my capacity as a Minister of the Crown made on behalf of the Crown such a request, I have acceded to the principle, and it has been practically complied with, that the Crown should, through the mouth of the Minister, state the demands of the Crown to the House. That is the justification which I have to make for the Motion I now make that the House should, at nine o'clock tomorrow evening, resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion made and proposed, "That this House will tomorrow, at Nine of the Clock in the evening, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*(9.12.) MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I the trust House will afford me its indulgence while I address it on a question which I deemt o be of the most serious importance. The right hon. Gentleman, in his capacity of Minister of the Crown, has asked this House for Supply to be granted to the Crown. I know of no such proceeding as that which the right hon. Gentleman has asked the House to follow. The demand of the Crown for Supply is always, always has been, and always should be, a most formal and solemn act. It should be embodied in a Speech from the Throne, or, when that is not possible, by a Message signed, as the journals of this House always record, by His Majesty's own hand. It may be said that that is a formal matter. It is more than a formal matter; it is a testimony to the respect which the Sovereign himself owes to this House. It is not right to make a serious demand upon this House in an informal and slovenly way. If that is to be allowed, a Royal Message

superseded by a mere statement of a Minister of the Crown may be further superseded, and we may have the demand for supplies made merely by a newspaper paragraph. I attach much importance to the formalities of this House, and especially to those which testify to the respect not only of the people, but of the Sovereign of this country. They are none of them unimportant. Therefore I cannot admit that the statement which the right hon. Gentleman has now made is sufficient to oust the necessity for a proper Message from the Crown.

The right hon. Gentleman tells us that this Supply was not asked for in May, only because His Majesty's Ministers had misunderstood the terms of the peace they had made with the Boers. That is what his statement amounts to. He says they understood that the three millions grant was to come out of a Transvaal loan, but that since then the Boers have explained to them that they were mistaken in their view, and that the three millions were intended to be, as no doubt it was, and as most people understood, a payment by Great Britain, recoverable, perhaps from the Transvaal, but certainly payable immediately by this country to the Boers. I really do not think that such a reason can fairly and properly be addressed to the House for the failure on the part of the Government to submit their demand for Supply, while Supply was still open, and while the Appropriation Bill was unpassed. There are still more serious matters of question which I will pass by. But now as to the question of Order. There was a Sessional Order on Supply passed by this House on the 28th April. I must presume that since the Minister has made this demand, he has consulted the authorities of the House, and that they have admitted and allowed that it is not inconsistent with that Sessional Order. But I myself cannot reconcile the language of the Order with this procedure. The Sessional Order limits the number of days to be allotted, and provides that those days must end at the 5th August. Besides these, it allows for other days unallotted. This new service may be appropriate to the unallotted days, but allotted or unallotted, the rule clearly lays it down that any additional Estimate for any new matter not included in the original Estimates shall be submitted for consideration in Committee of Supply on some day not later than two days before the Committee is closed. I cannot understand how, after Supply has closed, after the Report of Supply has been agreed to, and after the guillotine has fallen and brought to an end allotted and unallotted days alike, this new matter can be submitted now. If, indeed, it is to be held—as I must assume it is—that this Rule does not apply to present circumstances, if indeed we are held to be outside the Rule of Supply which was passed as a Sessional Order on the 28th April last, then the whole Rule goes by the board. For instance, the Rule limits the discussion of Supply to a certain number of days. That limit goes if the Rule goes. The Rule provides for the guillotine at the end of the number of days. The conditions go and the guillotine also goes, and we may engage in unlimited discussion on the Supply now presented to us.

But I am not careful to insist on the formal Rule or the interpretation of it. For I have a much more serious matter to submit. Will the House permit me to say what in my opinion the right method of Supply is? Standing Order 54 indicates the course which should be adopted. It provides—

"That this House will appoint the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means at the commencement of every Session as soon as the Address has been agreed to in answer to His Majesty's Speech."

I am far from saying that that precludes Supply being set up at any other time than that specified by the Standing Order; but I do say that that Standing Order indicates to the House the proper and only regular mode of procedure in regard to setting up Supply. There is a formal and solemn demand by the Crown for Supply addressed to the House of Commons, and power is given to move Amendments to the King's Speech in order to consider grievances. No Supply can be set up until those grievances have been disposed of and until the Address in reply to the gracious Speech has been agreed to. That is what enshrines the principle that Grievance shall come before Supply. And when the Committee of Supply has done its work it reports to the House, the Report is agreed to, and the final act of the Session is the passing of the Appropriation Bill. The control of Parliament over national finances rests solely on the Appropriation Act. It is not Votes in Supply that gives the Government money to spend. It is the Appropriation Act, which is the only legal authority to the Ministry to spend a farthing of the money voted in Supply. Votes in Supply are after all only resolutions of this House, but the Appropriation Act is the Act of Parliament, not of this House only but of the other House as well, which has power if not to originate, yet to right it, and the Act of the Sovereign who gives his assent. So true is it that the Act and the Act alone is the authority, that if a session be prorogued before and without the Appropriation Act being passed, every Vote of the House of Commons becomes thereby voided and null as though it had never been passed. I desire to read a few extracts from the greatest authority on this most important constitutional point, because it is the foundation of my argument, that nothing is anything except the Appropriation Act. I will quote from the very best work on the constitution of this country, viz., "Law and Practice of the Constitution," by Sir William Anson, whose authority is not in the least lessened by his having left the uncertain emoluments of literature for the more secure position of Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education. He says—

> "The sums voted to meet the army, navy, and civil service estimates cannot be legally paid until they are embodied in the Appropriation Act, and the House of Commons, in order to get the Supplies of the whole year into one Bill, reserves the Appropriation Bill until the close of the session."

And again—

> "It is not the need of Supply, but of the appropriation of Supply and of the Army Act which makes it legally necessary for Parliament to sit every year. If Parliament did not appropriate the Supplies of the year to specific purposes, the money which comes in on account of the various items of taxation could not legally be paid out to meet the services of the year, except in the case of such charges upon the revenue as are permanently authorised by statute."

Let me for a moment ask the House to observe the extreme importance of this. I have said that the Government cannot spend a farthing legally without the authority of the Appropriation Act. It may receive very large revenues indeed without the annual interposition of this House, and without its permission, but it cannot spend the money. Let us consider what revenue it does receive, without the annual consent of the House, through permanent Acts of Parliament. In this year, 1902–1903, the Government estimate to raise a revenue of £161,700,000; of that sum £112,500,000 is permanent revenue raised by taxes imposed on the nation by permanent Acts of Parliament, and for not one penny of which, therefore, the Government need come to the House. Why, you could run an Empire on £112,500,000. My belief is that the German Empire is run on less. But, although they obtain that £112,000,000, not one farthing of it can the Government spend without the sanction of an Appropriation Act. Were it otherwise the Government need never call Parliament together at all. I think I have shown, therefore, that it is the Appropriation Act and not votes in Supply that is important. Now, if the House will permit me, I will read one or two more quotations to show the importance of retaining the Appropriation Act until the end of the session. Here is what that great financial authority, Sir George Cornwall Lewis, said before the Committee of Public Accounts in 1857—

> "The Appropriation Act at the end of the session gathers together the whole of the Votes in Supply and the grants already authorised out of the Consolidated Fund to meet in part the Supplies voted; the balance of ways and means required to cover all the sums charged on the Supplies of the year is set forth in this Act, which thus completes the financial proceedings of this session. . . . The final grant of ways and means to cover the whole of the Supplies voted in the session is always reserved for the Appropriation Act; thus, although the House of Commons, at an early period of the session, might have voted the whole of the Supplies of the year, they could still hold their constitutional check upon the Minister."

Another eminent authority, who has also been removed to a higher sphere, Sir Courtenay Ilbert, says in his work "Legislative Methods and Forms"—

> "When all the Supply of the session has been voted, an Appropriation Act is passed providing the balance of ways and means required for the session and appropriating in detail the various sums voted out of the Consolidated Fund to the different purposes specified in the Resolutions passed in the Committee of Supply as agreed by the House. The Act includes all the Supply voted in the session for the service of whatever year may be intended."

Finally I may quote what the Speaker of this House said in 1841—

> "The Appropriation is always reserved for the end of the session, and it is irregular to introduce any Clause of Appropriation into a revenue or other Bill passing through Parliament at an earlier period."

Of course, the House is aware that what are called Consolidated Fund Acts are often passed before the Appropriation Act, but not one of those Acts appropriates; they are merely Acts to enable the Treasury to issue money, and the money so issued and all other moneys are brought into the one final Appropriation Act for the reasons I have given. The House, so long as it has the control of the Appropriation Act, has control of the Ministers. Now let me give one last quotation as to this from "Hallam." He says, in language which I can ill approach, but which I earnestly commend to the House—

> "A House of Commons would be deeply responsible to the country if, through supine confidence, it should abandon that high privilege which has made it the arbiter of Court factions and the regulator of foreign connections."

My argument is that that is virtually what we are asked to do. We are asked to abandon that. The Appropriation Act, as I think I have shown, always has been and always should be, if this House is to retain its power over the Ministers, the very last Act of the Session. It is, as it were, the sessional last will and testament of the House; and just as the testator reserves to the last moment of his life the power of varying and changing his will and thus retaining his control over his own property, this House should retain its power over the Appropriation Bill to the end of the Session.

Now it may be said, "If there be such virtue in an Appropriation Bill, why should we not have two, and thereby increase the virtue?" That argument reminds me of the young lady who was asked whether she would not have a nice decent husband of fifty, and who replied that she would rather have two of twenty-five. It is a trifling illustration, and I hope the House will pardon it. But why not have two Appropriation Bills? If I were endeavouring to persuade a convinced Tory permeated with sound constitutional feelings and full of reverence for the forms and traditions of the House—without which no man ever became a great Parliamentarian—I would reply to that question by saying that the answer is sufficient that the House had never done otherwise than have one Appropriation Bill, and one only. But if I were trying to persuade those who are children in these matters I would say that the reason why we can not properly have two Appropriation Bills in the same Session is because it is absolutely essential to the financial control of the House that the whole finances of the year should be submitted to Parliament in one complete scheme embodied in one Appropriation Bill. Without this the House loses all control. Let the House consider. The Budget presents in one picture all the financial needs and all the financial resources of the year. It is upon that picture that the House judges whether it will agree that to new taxes or to the remission of old taxes; whether it will submit to new burdens being placed not only on itself, it may be, but on posterity. It is upon that one financial statement that the House judges of the financial affairs of the nation. The Budget is, as it were, a Pandora's box, full of taxes, evils and miseries; yet at the bottom is Hope, in the shape of an Appropriation Bill. But if this Pandora's box, has a false bottom and we find that below the false bottom there are other taxes, miseries and evils and no complete Appropriation Bill covering all of them, then you have not only extorted the taxes on false grounds, but have also departed from the invariable and most necessary practice of finance in this House. Of course I admit at once that there are emergencies which cannot be foreseen in the Budget. Wars may arise and new expenditure may become necessary, that could not be foreseen. But there is proper provision made for dealing with those. There are well-known provisions. There are Votes of credit. Votes of Credit have been indulged in more than once, but never after the passing of the Appropriation Act. Then there is the system of the Supplementary Votes—a most nefarious system. I know of nothing more calculated to enable a Minister to destroy the system of finance of this country than that of Supplementary Estimates. But these are the methods which can be resorted to before the Appropriation Act in Committee of Supply. One Committee of Supply, one Budget and one

Appropriation Act. Depart from that, and you immediately come into financial chaos and the loss of all power of this House over the Ministers.

No doubt, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, we are sitting here at this time under very unusual and extraordinary circumstances. This has been called an Autumn Session. I submit it is nothing of the kind. It is a series of supplemental sittings tacked on to the ordinary session, which, as I say, expired for all practical and certainly for all financial purposes when the Appropriation Act was passed. There is no doubt that a bisected session, with a second half devoted to supplementary sittings after the passing of the Appropriation Act is a very rare thing indeed. So far as I can trace it, such a thing has only occurred three times in the last 100 years. There were supplementary sittings in 1820 in order to pass a Bill of Attainder against Queen Caroline; there were supplemental sittings in 1882 in order to pass the Procedure Rules; and in 1893 in order to pass the Local Government Act. Now, Sir, on all those occasions—and I believe they are the only occasions that can be found in the last 100 years or in the last 200 years—the same conditions were observed. Each one of these series of supplemental sittings was reserved to the sole, single and specific purpose for which it was intended; and in none was an attempt made to set up a new Committee of Supply after the Appropriation Act had been passed. Therefore what is proposed to be done now is an entirely new thing; new to the ordinary practice of the House; new even to the exceptional practice of the House under which we are sitting here today; entirely new and entirely unknown. In 1882 so strongly was it felt that you could not properly proceed with matters of this kind after the Appropriation Act had passed, that the very first thing that occurred on the meeting of the House in October, was that Lord Randolph Churchill moved the adjournment of the House on the ground that it was the settled Constitutional principle that when once the Appropriation Act had been passed the House could not proceed to do any other business whatsoever. The noble Lord was followed into the lobby by my right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University, my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury—whom I am sorry not to see in his place—the present Lord Chancellor, and by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They were all of opinion that it was impossible to do any business of any kind whatever after the Appropriation Act. It is true that that was in the young and enthusiastic days of the first Lord of the Treasury, when he was a shining light and a Member militant of the Fourth Party. It is true that in those days the right hon. Gentleman did not hold quite the same views he holds now, for he denounced these sittings and also denounced the closure as a reckless tampering with the Constitution, and especially the closure by the Chairman of Committees as a provision which struck deep at the dignity of Parliament. Of course the right hon. Gentleman has reformed now. He has, I believe, entirely repudiated his connexion with the Fourth Party; he has turned his back on his poor relations, and the last of them is now relegated to a seat below the gangway. But at that time, in 1882, it was the view of the great legal authority who now presides over the Courts of the land, it was the view of the Fourth Party, and it was the view of Sir Stafford Northcote, that no business whatever should be done after the Appropriation Act was passed. Now, Sir, I do not go so far as that. I am a moderate man; I am not like my right hon. friends the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not claim to stop all business, but I do go this far—that with regard to these irregular supplemental sittings, you ought to limit them strictly to the purposes for which they are called; in this case the passing of the Education Bill. I call upon the First Lord of the Treasury to support me here, because—on the very ground that these are sittings for a special purpose—the right hon. Gentleman refused the Irish Members a day to consider the undoubtedly important matter of the suspension of Constitutional guarantees in Ireland, and I equally claim his adhesion to my other proposition that if any other than the special business is to be taken in such irregular sittings as these, at any rate no business in Supply ought to be taken. I say that for financial purposes the time has gone by, and it is contrary to the very safety and power of this House to attempt to set up Supply afresh, after the Appropriation Act has been passed. It is sufficient for me to say, having regard to the special character of these sittings, in reply to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that never in such a state of things as this has Supply ever been attempted to be set up.

Of course I am the first to admit, even though we are in a very irregular and unusual position, and even if it be proved up to the hilt that the fault of our being in this position lies with the Treasury Bench, that it is absolutely necessary for the honour of the country, that these £3,000,000 should be paid to the Transvaal—not out of the Transvaal, not out of some doubtful loan, but out of our own pockets; out of our own money. I fully agree to that, and in this irregular situation in which I find myself, I ask myself what could be done. I think the resources of procedure are not yet exhausted. I think there are methods by which the necessary money might be found for meeting this pressing expenditure. There are two methods of meeting the difficulty. The first is that the expenditure of this money should be sanctioned by an Address originating in the House—a method such as was adopted in the case of the retiring allowance to Mr. Speaker Peel—an Address to the Sovereign requesting that the money might be provided and undertaking that it should be made good. That is not I think for this purpose a good method. But there is another. The King may send a Message setting forth some new necessity, and then there may be an Address to the King requesting him to authorise the issue of the necessary sums and undertaking to make them good. Then they would be made good in the Supplementary Estimates of the next session and so appear in the Appropriation Bill of next year. That is the clear and the right way to provide such sums. Let me point out to the House that these £3,000,000 have been pledged by an Act of the Prerogative of the Crown. The Crown has made a treaty and undertaken to do the things under that treaty necessitating this expenditure. It is a natural thing under these circumstances that the Sovereign should, in a proper and formal way, notify these engagements to the House, and call upon the House to make them good, and that the House should address a Message in reply, and say it will make them good. That was the procedure adopted in 1721, when the King made a treaty with Sweden, and came under some financial engagements. That was the course that was pursued then; a Message came to this House and it was printed in the Journals, where it can be seen, and thus it was in the year 1748, when the hereditary jurisdiction of Scotch Lairds was abolished. As I am speaking here, somewhat presumptuously I am afraid, as a financial purist, I may say that I am not enamoured of dealing with these matters in this way, by a sort of Parliamentary promissory note. It is only in my endeavour to assist the Chancellor of the Exchequer that I suggest this way out, and it is owing to the right hon. Gentleman insisting upon going his own wicked other way that I am obliged to make this speech tonight.

It will be seen that my objections to the course pursued tonight are objections not to the form, but to the substance. Not only is it contrary to all the usages and the settled practice of this House, but it is calculated to diminish the power of the House of Commons itself. It not only completely abolishes the doctrine of grievance before Supply, but it is Supply without any grievance at all. There is no King's Speech, no proper demand for Supply, so far as I can admit, and it is therefore Supply without grievance. Standing Order 56, which I presume will be followed, says that whenever Supply stands as an Order of the day Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without Question put, unless on first going into Committee of Supply an Amendment is put down or a question raised with regard to the Estimates. As you, Sir, are "first going into Committee of Supply" again, I presume a Motion will be made that you leave the Chair, and that any Amendments put down or questions raised will be duly debated.

But I have yet another objection to this fresh practice. It sets up a new precedent, and you never quite know where new precedents are going to lead you. I can see one direction in which it must inevitably lead. At present you have in one session one Budget, one Committee of Supply, one Appropriation Act. Once agree that there should be two Budgets, two Committees of Supply, and an unlimited number of Appropriation Acts in one session, and there is absolutely no reason why you should prorogue Parliament at all; there is no reason why you should not go on adjourning time after time, and keep the one session open during the whole continuance of a Parliament. That might mean a session of seven years. That is conceivable, and would be very inviting. See what a revolution it would mean: one King's Speech, one only in seven years, and in seven years one set of grivances only to be raised on Amendments to the King's Speech! In the hands of the casual occupants of the Treasury Bench an unlimited opportunity would be afforded for passing the most revolutionary measures, which could not possibly be entertained in one ordinary session, but which then might be passed in sevenths, one-seventh this year, another seventh next year, and so on. In the next Parliament, or the next session consisting of one Parliament, the next casual occupants of that Bench would have the same facilities for repealing the Act of their predecessors. A nice sort of see-saw might go on! Let not the House think that finance is a mere form. Finance lies at the bottom of all government. When you have bad finance you have bad everything. Bad finance brought about the fall of Rome, and led to the French Revolution. Bad finance always leads to either ruin or revolution.

Let me beg the House to beware how they agree to this proposal. During the last thirty years one financial security after another has been pared away, and you now have false accounts of your expenditure, an entirely incomplete control of your issues and receipts, a system of audit which I believe to be altogether illusory, and a very much diminished control by this House over expenditure. It is time to make some stand in regard to this procedure. Our rules are in a very chaotic condition. Some are in a fragmentary state, others have been proved to be wholly ill-considered, and, although perhaps adapted to the exigencies of the Government at the time they were adopted, calculated to lead to very serious results under other circumstances. Let not this House agree to be formalists for Members and anarchists for Ministers. If there are pit-falls consisting of inverted commas, references to newspapers, and so forth, which trip a Member up when he wishes to ask a Question, let us not disregard the settled traditions of this House when it is a question of keeping Ministers in order. Of course, I can understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Allowance must be made for him; he is a "sturdy beggar" by profession; it is his business to be so. But the First Lord of the Treasury—where is he? He is the Leader of this House, the proper guardian of its rights, privileges and powers. He is also the head of the Conservative Party, pledged to resist every innovation not justified by necessity. That he should be a party to what I consider to be a very serious infringement of the rights and powers of this House, and yet be absent when the matter is being discussed, is, I think, somewhat surprising.

The rules and traditions of this House are the inheritance of the people of England, whose representatives we are. They have grown up out of experience founded on reason. It is most dangerous to touch them, or to set up new precedents in contradiction of them. The formalities of this House are not, and never have been, merely formal. They represent the necessities of the case and embody the protection and defence of Members of this House. It is the formalities, traditions, and rules of this House that enable the minority to debate and persuade; it is they that ensure that in Parliament the Members should be allowed to parley with the Minister before the Act of State is done. One after another I have seen the opportunities of debate taken from us; one after another I have seen taken away the occasions upon which any Member might touch upon any other subjects than those the Government choose to put down. I have no hope whatever of prevailing in my argument tonight, but I warn the House that if it allows its forms and traditions one by one to be broken down, and the sanctions of its power to be destroyed, it will end by being not the glory, but the reproach and the by-word, of the Empire. This House has resisted and destroyed the tyranny of Monarchs, it has survived and emerged from the corruption of Ministers and of Members; and it has done so because, although sometimes it may have wanted virtue, it has never yet wanted spirit. If now it does want spirit its end as a useful institution of this country is near; and it will not merely have suffered, it will have invited and deserved the doom that will befall it.

(10.4) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It is a refreshing circumstance to hear constitutional doctrine preached from the Benches of the constitutional party. We seldom hear it in words; we never see it in practice. What the hon. Member for King's Lynn has said is perfectly true, that the proposal made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer is an unexampled one. I do not say that we have not as much right to make precedents as our predecessors, and therefore I am not going to take any narrow ground upon that subject; but it is very useful and very necessary that the House of Commons should have respect for the practice which it has followed for generations and even for centuries. Above all, as the hon. Member has justly said, it is in matters of finance, which lie at the root of all good government (and never was there a time when the expenditure of this country had risen to so unprecedented a height) that we ought to be the more careful in regard to any deviations from the securities which this House has established for their regulation and control. That is a proposition which I think will be accepted by both sides of the House. Therefore, if we are to enter upon a new and unexampled course we ought to be amply satisfied that there is some unexampled and exceptional reason for taking this course which is without precedent.

Now, what is the exceptional circumstance here? We are asked to go into Supply for the purpose of authorising the Government to expend money which they did not ask for before the Appropriation Bill. But all the circumstances which make them ask for it now were perfectly well known to them for months before the Appropriation Bill. This is expenditure which arises out of the terms of peace made between the Government and the Boer generals. That was in the month of May. The Appropriation Bill was taken in the beginning of August, and during the whole of the time from the month of May to the beginning of August His Majesty's Government was in possession of all the circumstances upon which they now found this demand. Why was not this demand made in June, in July, or the beginning of August? In these circumstances there is no justification for departing from the established practice of the Constitution with reference to Supply and the Appropriation Bill. The demand was as urgent then as it is now. What account have they to give of their unintelligible neglect—I do not wish to say an offensive word, so I will not say blundering—in not taking that course in June and July, and in not taking the ordinary course in the House of Commons with reference to finance, and asking for the money in the proper manner and at the proper time? Let us see how the matter stands. In April, when the first Budget was brought in by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, he asked this pertinent question—

> "Perhaps I may be asked what is to happen if peace should come in a few weeks, and if the large sums of fifty-six or fifty-seven millions I have suggested should not be all required for the purpose of the war?"

Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer indicated various things that would happen, but what is to the present purpose is this. Having provided for the immediate consequences of the war, he said:

> "Means will have to be provided for something more, something which, I am sure, will be more agreeable to the minds of all of us than expenditure on war. Means will have to be provided for the relief and resettlement of the two colonies which have been so terribly devastated by the war; means will have to be provided for rebuilding and restocking the farms—the farms, I should hope, not only of those who have been our friends in the war, and who have fought on our side, but also of those who have boldly and honestly been our enemies in the war, and whom we hope to make our friends in future."

That is a contemplation of the very things which constitute the two principal articles of the £5,000,000 which is the Estimate we are now asked to go into

Committee of Supply to vote. Then he said:

> "I think the House of Commons, if peace is made on terms which we believe will be satisfactory, enduring, and safe, will be generous in these matters, and yet I do not believe that they need involve any great charge on this country."

Therefore, the contemplation of the Government from the first was that these matters so referred to were not to be a great charge on the country—that is, the British taxpayer.

> "I am convinced," continued the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, "looking at the remarkable progress which has been already made even during the war in the restoration of industrial prosperity in the goldfields, and in the more important centres of the Transvaal, that it will be perfectly possible for the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, if we were to advance to them a loan for the purposes I have described (for railway extension, and so on), to repay such advances, both capital and interest, on terms which would be eminently satisfactory to the taxpayers of this country."

Therefore, the policy of the Government on these points from the beginning of the war down to now, that it would cost this country very little, was in respect of these very particulars. In the Budget, the Chancellor of the Exchequer held forth the hope that, if peace were made these things would be provided for, but that they would not be provided for at the expense of the British taxpayer. But then the Chancellor of the Exchequer came forward in June, after the peace was made, after all these conditions were known, after it was known that this was to be a free gift on the part of the Government to the Boer generals, with an amended balance-sheet. He made a speech on that occasion, and, having shown what would be the altered condition of things in consequence of peace, he said—

> "I referred in the Budget speech to the measures in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony for the relief and resettlement of the population, for the rebuilding and restocking of farms, and for other purposes. We may very possibly have to make temporary advances of that kind, but as soon as the civil administration is established in the colonies, and the necessary arrangements can be made, we shall ask Parliament to aid in this matter, not by direct advances, but by guaranteeing a loan to be raised by the colonies for the purposes I have named, and such other objects," and so on.

Therefore, here was the declaration of the Government by their financial representative after peace was made, after the terms were known, and more than two months before the Appropriation Bill, as to the course they intended to take. What is the meaning now of the Government coming forward and saying, "We did not know"? We have been told, at the beginning of the war, "How could we know?" so how could you know in June, July, and August what was the real meaning of the terms you were making with the Boers, and whether the charge was to fall on the Transvaal, or whether it was to fall on the British taxpayer. Now in October you come to correct the blunders you made in June and July.

That is the situation of the Government in this matter. There is not a circumstance they know now which they did not know in June and July. The terms of peace were known, and the undertaking they had come to with the Boer Generals was that the payment should be by the British taxpayer and not by loan on the Transvaal; and yet they have been holding out the prospect that a good part of the expenses of the war would be borne by the gold mines and the people of the Transvaal. They now come round to the position I have always maintained, that the whole cost will fall on the British taxpayer, and the British taxpayer alone. But with reference to this procedure, the Government, through the late Chancellor of the Exchequer say:—

> "These are to be temporary advances, and I would therefore ask the House to leave my hands free in that matter, with the distinct understanding that if it is possible all these six millions shall be devoted to the reduction of our present Debt."

How has the House been dealt with in this matter? You obtain in June, though the peace had been made, power to raise a loan of £30,000,000, on a distinct representation as to what was to be done with that loan—a loan far beyond what was wanted for the purposes of the war—and, on certain representations as to what would be done with the excess of that loan if the House authorized it. If there is anything perilous in this world, it is that the House of Commons should be induced by the Executive Government to grant them money, whether in the form of Supply or a loan, on conditions which are not fulfilled.

*MR. RITCHIE: The right hon. Gentleman will pardon me; surely that is a matter for discussion when we come to the Vote, it cannot be germane to the present proposal.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Certainly it is germane to the present proposal. What justification is there in the plea of exceptional circumstances when you knew everything two months before the Appropriation Bill, which would have called upon you to ask the House of Commons through Committee of Supply to get authority for this money? You got the money before the Appropriation Bill upon the representation that it would not fall upon the British taxpayer, but that it would fall upon the Transvaal. I have in my hand the Paper laid before Parliament on June 9th, as the corrected Budget statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—a most formal, a most authoritative document—in which it is represented in dealing with the Supply and in dealing with the loan that the deficit is to be met out of the proceeds of the Consol loan of £29,000,000, and then there is this note—

> "Leaving available for contingencies and redemption of unfunded Debt, £5,996,000."

That is an undertaking to this House that that would be dealt with for the purpose of reducing the British Debt. Now this is a proposal that, instead of using that money, which was pledged for the redemption of the Debt, it is to be taken out of the revenue of the year. The Government pledged themselves to place this money on a loan upon the Transvaal, and, instead of carrying out their declared intention regarding the redemption of the British Debt, the charge is to fall upon the British taxpayer. That is the situation. I say it is a most formidable situation in dealing with finance at any time, above all at a time when you are adding £150,000,000 to your Debt and you have your taxation at the point which it has reached. Was there ever a time when a Government was less justified in departing from the strict rules which govern finance? The Government came forward and represented to the House that it was represented to them that these particular charges would, if it were necessary to ask for them as temporary advances, be repaid by a guaranteed loan chargeable upon the gold mines of South Africa. I suspect very much that it is not so much the difficulty that the Boers have raised in this matter as the refusal of the gold mines to bear the charge which lay at the bottom of the whole thing.

For the last three years I have maintained that the idea that you were going to obtain the cost of this war, or any part of it, out of the gold mines which were to benefit, we were told, so enormously, was illusory. Day by day it becomes more and more clear that the idea that you were going to get any relief whatever for the British taxpayer from sources of this kind was a complete delusion. Then I ask what justification have the Government in this case? What do they say? They found out—when did they find out?—the truth in regard to these statements. Who was it who informed them what was the meaning of their own agreement with the Boers? How was it that they came forward in the month of June, and said, they were only bound to make a temporary advance, and that that would be recouped as soon as the regular Government was established and be available for the reduction of the British Debt. A regular Government had been established. When did this enlightenment come upon the Government as to the real meaning of the peace they had made? That is the whole question. The Government say, It is true we contemplated this temporary advance, but we found that we had made a peace we did not understand, and we cannot fulfil the pledges which in an absolutely formal way were laid in an authoritative document on the Table of Parliament. You call this an exceptional situation. But the facts of the case are today exactly what they were in the month of June, when the statement was made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to which I have called attention. But, if that was immediately after the peace, there was the whole of June, the whole of July, in which the Government might have devoted themselves to the study of their own peace. Then they might have come forward with this Motion before the Appropriation Bill, and there would have been no departure from the constitutional financial practice of this country. That is the situation.

We must, of course, fulfil faithfully the terms of peace. We must do that, but what we do complain of is that the responsible Government should come to this House and misrepresent—I do not say intentionally but from their own ignorance—the terms of peace. The idea that the £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 would not fall upon the British tax payer, but would be raised upon a Transvaal loan, was a delusion and an illusion. I am far from saying that the Government intentionally misled the House, but it is the business of the Government to understand their own business, and they should know upon whom the charge falls, whether upon the British taxpayer or elsewhere. Now we have got to the present month, and we have gone on up to this time in the belief that the statement of the Government was true and that there would be out of the revenue of this year £6,000,000 capable of being devoted to the reduction of the British Debt. Now we have found, on the Government's own confession, that all that £6,000,000 is to go on the taxation of the year, and consequently will fall upon the British taxpayer. That is the history of this proposal. I agree with the hon. member for King's Lynn that it is very objectionable, when you are creating a new precedent, to proceed in the happy-go-lucky, slip-slop manner in which this proposal has been introduced tonight. You are creating a new Committee of Supply, because the Committee of Supply of the Session has been closed in the proper manner. Of course we all know that if there is a case of unforeseen emergency the House of Commons will always be prepared to meet it. But this is not an unforeseen emergency. The emergency was foreseen, and might have been foreseen by everybody—except His Majesty's Government; it was there and could easily have been dealt with. The proper course would have been that there should be a formal message from the Crown. These things are not unimportant. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that it is a great disadvantage to depart from the well-established relations between the Crown and the House of Commons. Trifling with matters of this kind is not a sound doctrine and it is not good finance. But I am an old Constitutionalist. These are views which are now called "worn out shibboleths," which it is the fashion nowadays to despise. If you are going to establish a new financial practice, you cannot be too careful in preserving the principles upon which the established practice has been founded. Of course the whole of our Supply and financial proceedings rest on a Message from the Crown.

People say, "What does it matter what the Crown does or what the House of Commons does?" But this way of dealing with such matters is very mischievous and dangerous, especially in the present financial position in which we find ourselves. Although I perfectly agree that we ought to keep faith with the Boer generals, I say that we ought to have kept faith with thom before the Appropriation Bill was passed. I regret that we should appear tonight in such a ridiculous position, for which the Government are entirely responsible, having misled the House by laying down in a series of financial statements entirely contradictory representations in regard to the people on whom this burden would ultimately fall. I wish even now that the Government would take pains to present the matter in the proper form to the House, that it should be presented to the House as what it properly is, a new Committee of Supply, and that it should be presented in regular form as a Committee of Supply. It would then come before you, Mr. Speaker, upon the Motion that you leave the chair, and we should be placed in the ordinary and regular position of a Committee of Supply. That would be to show some respect for the financial safeguards by which we have surrounded and protected the taxpayers of this country. I say nothing about the new Rule—because it has been broken almost as soon as it is made. I do not value the new Rule. You may break the new Rules as you please, and the sooner they are broken, I think, the better. A few months ago it was provided by the Rule—

> "That any additional Estimate for any new service or matter not included in the original Estimate for the year shall be submitted for consideration in Committee of Supply on some day not later than two days before the Committee is closed."

Of course, this is a "new matter." This arose out of a peace made with the

Boers in the month of May last. There was plenty of time between the conclusion of peace and the month of August, before the Committee of Supply closed, to bring forward this "new matter," and, therefore, this is a deliberate breach of the Rule you have made. I think you might have the grace to suspend the Rule for tomorrow, because your present action is in flagrant and ridiculous violation of your own new Rule. There does not seem to me to be any justification for the course you have pursued. In my opinion, the House of Commons, with reference to this matter, and, what is still more important, the people represented by the House of Commons, that is, the taxpayers of this country, have been deluded by representations that this was a charge which would not fall upon them, but would justly fall upon those whom we were told have so largely benefited by the peace that was made, and, therefore, it was only just that those men who had benefited by the gold mines should bear this burden. We were told even more emphatically by the Colonial Secretary that the mine-owners had ample means to bear this burden, and that they ought to bear it to a considerable degree. Now, apparently this very first item which you undertook to place upon the Transvaal alone is not to be so placed. It is a most unfortunate thing that the House of Commons, and the taxpayers as represented by the House of Commons, should have been misled in this matter, and that there should have arisen the necessity for this unprecedented proceeding in respect of the Votes in Supply of this House.

*(10.40.) MR. RITCHIE: The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has not lent any considerable amount of support to the argument of my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn. My hon. friend devoted the main part of his speech to the question of procedure. The right hon. Gentleman devoted a very small portion of his speech to the question of procedure, and a very large portion to the merits of the Vote.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: To the procedure of His Majesty's Government.

*MR. RITCHIE: But with special reference to the merits of the Vote, as to whether or not the Government were justified, after the declaration they had made, in coming down to the House and asking them to put on the British taxpayer a burden which they had understood previously to be on the taxpayers of the Transvaal. That was the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, and that is what I meant by saying that his speech was directed not so much to the question of procedure as against the laches of the Government for having first stated they were going to provide this money in one way and then coming to the House and asking it to provide it in another. That was not the point to which my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn devoted his speech. The speech of my hon. friend, if I may be permitted to say so, was much more germane to the Motion which I have made tonight than was the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, which, I think, would more properly be dealt with when we come to discuss this matter in Committee of Supply. But before I sit down I shall devote some attention to the remarks which the right hon. Gentleman made. My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn has, as we expected him to do, devoted his time to showing the House what an extremely careful and critical examination he has made of the historical circumstances which are in any degree analogous to the proposition which we are now making. Without entering into all the points which he has raised, I think I am right in saying that the main burden of his speech was that, after the Appropriation Bill, no further business ought to have been carried on, and certainly there ought not to be any further Vote in Committee of Supply.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES dissented.

*MR. RITCHIE: But my hon. friend did make a considerable point about the taking of any other business after the closing of Supply, and I think he quoted some votes in 1882 which were given by myself, by the Leader of the Government, and by other members of the Government, as showing that we concurred in his view that no business ought to have been taken.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon, but I distinctly said that that was not my view. I did not go so far as the right hon. Gentleman himself. I did not say that no business should be taken.

*MR. RITCHIE: Then I fail to understand why my hon. friend quoted our votes, because that was the particular question which was before the House in 1882.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I quoted them to show that the right hon. Gentleman went much further and was less moderate than myself.

*MR. RITCHIE: I think my hon. friend will remember that he endeavoured to make a considerable point of the fact that we did give our votes in the direction which he approved of. If he had pursued his investigation a little further he would have found that the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Gentleman who sits next to him, and many other right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Gentlemen who now sit upon that side of the House, voted directly against the proposition which my hon. friend is now supporting. Therefore, if he is able to quote our votes, I may quote the votes of nearly the whole of the Front Bench opposite against the proposition which my hon. friend has made—namely, that business ought not to be taken after the Committee of Supply has been closed.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It did not apply to the question of Supply.

*MR. RITCHIE: My hon. friend made a much larger proposition than that.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: My right hon. friend is unconsciously entirely and absolutely misrepresenting me. I told the House, and I quoted the votes that the right hon. Gentleman and the Fourth Party voted in 1882, that no business whatever should be taken after the Appropriation Act. I stated that I did not go so far as that, and what I contended was that only the special business for which these supplemental sittings were called should be taken, and certainly there should be no re-opening of Committee of Supply.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am sorry I did not take down my hon. friend's words. I confess I fail to understand why my hon. friend gave himself the trouble of quoting our votes. It is not important, and I need not carry it any further. What is my hon. friend's argument? It is that no Government, whatever may be the circumstances that require it, ought ever to come forward at an Autumn sitting and ask for further Supply after the Appropriation Bill has been passed, unless they adopt a particular course which he has set up—namely, that there should be a Message from the Sovereign. He explained that by that he meant a Message under the Sign Manual. He also went the length of saying that the Message ought to be replied to by the House by an Address to the Crown, and, in fact, that we ought to have a new session. In point of fact, what he intended to say, and what he himself believed in, was that Committee of Supply should not again be set up in one session after the Appropriation Bill had been passed. That means that, whatever circumstances might arise, however much might be the demand for Supply, if there is an Autumn sitting no Supply should be granted, but the session ought to be wound up and a new session begun with a Speech from the Throne and an Address from the House. Now, Sir, I think that is not borne out by anything which has happened in the past. My hon. friend has referred to some authorities. I will quote from Sir Erskine May—the eighth edition. He says this:

> "When the supplies for the service of the year have all been granted, the Committee of Supply discontinues its sittings; but care must be taken not to close the Committee until all the necessary votes have been taken;

for, if designedly closed, it can only be regularly reopened by a demand for further supplies from the Crown by Message, or the communication of additional estimates.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask why the right hon. Gentleman makes a point of the date?

* MR. RITCHIE: Because I think it is the last edition edited by Sir Erskine May. In accordance with that *dictum* I have conveyed to the House, as a Minister of the Crown, a Message to the effect that the Crown requires further Supplies, and I have also presented an additional Estimate, so that I have complied with both of the requirements set forth by Sir Erskine May.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Not as to the Message.

*MR. RITCHIE: Sir Erskine May does not say that there should be a Message under the Sign Manual. Well now, what is proposed by my hon. friend? My hon. friend, after stating that, in his opinion, there was only one proper way of meeting the difficulty—namely, a new session—added that he could have told the Government two other ways in which they might have acted and which would have been proper ways. He named one—an address by the House—only to dismiss it as not being applicable, and as being open to many objections. The other was that the Crown should send a Message to the House, and that the House should then declare its readiness to make good the necessary Supplies. In that event I understand no Vote could be taken by the House until the following session. I ask the House whether they consider that that would be as satisfactory a manner of dealing with the question as that which I now propose. After all, this Vote is for part of the expenditure which has been made during the year. I maintain that either of the proposals of my hon. friend would have been open to ten-fold more objection than can be legitimately brought against the proposal I have made, and although, as I have admitted at the commencement, this is a most unusual proceeding, yet, having regard to the unusual circumstances, I contend that it is the proceeding most in accordance with the best traditions of the House of Commons, and infinitely superior to the methods suggested by my hon. friend. It was essential that we should come to the House, If we had provided the money without coming to the House at all, we should have been properly condemned. We chose what we considered the right and proper course of immediately coming to the House and asking for a vote of money. The only other alternative was not to give the money at all till next session; and to have delayed finding the money for these purposes would have been the most fatal course of all in the interests of peace and prosperity in South Africa. Therefore, though I do not pretend that this course is free from objection, I say it is freest from objection of any course we could have taken.

The right hon. Gentleman has objected to our proceedings on very different grounds. He said that we had no business to come to the House of Commons at all. He says that we made up our minds quite properly in May or June that this money was not to be got out of the pockets of the British taxpayer, but by way of a loan on the Transvaal; and that, having come to that decision, we ought to adhere to it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I did not say that at all. I charged the Government with misunderstanding and misrepresenting to the House their obligations under the Treaty. I did not say that you must adhere to a statement which was contrary to your pledges. But I said that you had departed from the settled practice of the House by not having brought forward this Vote before the Appropriation Bill.

* MR. RITCHIE: Then what is the meaning of the right hon Gentleman's

observation to the effect that the main reason why we have altered our minds was that we found ourselves unable to get the money out of the mine-owners of the Transvaal, as we ought to have done? His opinion was that instead of asking the British taxpayers to pay the money we ought to have got it out of the mine-owners of the Transvaal. I understand now that the right hon. Gentleman does not object in principle to the taxpayers being called upon to pay this sum.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I do not object, because you are bound to do it. While you were misrepresenting your obligations, you found out that you must charge the taxpayers.

*Mr. RITCHIE: We never found out anything of the kind. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman was in the House when I made a short statement at the beginning in bringing the Motion before the House. This course was not decided on because we thought that we had misunderstood or misinterpreted the terms of surrender. On the contrary, I stated distinctly that in our opinion the terms of surrender were perfectly compatible with the view that this money was to be paid out of sums to be raised by way of loan on the Transvaal.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Do you call that a free gift?

*Mr. RITCHIE: It was a free gift to the Boers.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: How could it be when they were the people on whom the loan was to be charged? It would be levied upon them in the way of taxation.

*Mr. RITCHIE: If a present is made to the right hon. Gentleman of a large sum from the Exchequer, will he say that it is not a free gift to him because it is paid for out of taxation? Surely, Sir, it was a fair interpretation of the terms of surrender that we were to give a free gift to the Boers, who had suffered by the war, although it was raised out of the taxation of the Transvaal. I contend that the terms would have been amply satisfied if we had taken this money out of the Transvaal loan, and that was our understanding, and that continued to be our understanding. That was the reason why no Vote was asked for in June or July when we were in Committee of Supply. But it came to our knowledge that the Boers had understood this particular article of the terms of surrender in a different way, and that they had understood that this money was to be paid for out of the British Exchequer. That being so, I contend that we were acting perfectly rightly—in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the action we took, and in order to take away from the Boers any feeling of a grievance which they might otherwise have had—we were acting perfectly right in saying, "In these circumstances we will not ask the taxpayers of the Transvaal to pay this money; we will ask the British taxpayers to pay it." And I understand that the right hon. Gentleman does not himself object to that.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Of course I say that when you promise to do a thing you must do it. But I say that you ought not to misrepresent to the House of Commons the promise you have made.

*Mr. RITCHIE: Yes; but the right hon. Gentleman knew what the terms of surrender were. They were published. He knew as well as we did that the money was to be raised from the Transvaal.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Because you said so.

*Mr. RITCHIE: But surely the right hon. Gentleman does not always believe what we say?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have always tried to believe what the Chancellor of the Exchequer says. I hope I always shall.

*MR. RITCHIE: Well, my contention is simply this, that the right hon. Gentleman had these terms of surrender before him, and he, like the Government, believed that this grant which was to be made to the Boers was to be taken out of the loan which was to be raised from the Transvaal. That was what the Government believed, and that was what the right hon. Gentleman believed when he saw the terms of surrender. But I put this to the right hon. Gentleman. If he had been in my position, and it had been represented to him and to his Government that the Boers had signed the terms of surrender in the full belief that this money was to be provided by the British Exchequer, whatever his own views and the views of his Government had been, would he or would he not have imperilled the good feeling which we hope to establish between ourselves and the Boers by rigidly insisting upon his own interpretation of those terms, and by disregarding the view which the Boers took? I say if we had done so, and if in consequence we had created a sore on their part which was not likely to be healed for years, instead of establishing, as we hoped to establish, a feeling of friendship and co-operation, notwithstanding our full belief that we were right in our interpretation of these articles of surrender, we should have been deservedly blamed. We said "We will let you have the money out of the British Exchequer instead of putting it upon the Transvaal," and I am satisfied that we are taking a course which is right and which the right hon. Gentleman and those around him would themselves have pursued if they had been in the same position as we are. I maintain, first of all, therefore, that although the course which we have adopted has been an exceptional course, the circumstances are so exceptional as to have justified us in taking that course, and that any other course that we could have adopted would have been attended with the greatest difficulty and been open to as much objection as the course we have now taken. And I also contend that, as far as the merits of the case were concerned, we were perfectly justified in our original contention—that this money should be provided for out of the Transvaal loan, and also that we were perfectly justified in departing from that understanding of ours rather than create ill-feeling between ourselves and the Boers with regard to a matter upon which there was, we admit, a legitimate misunderstanding. I hope the House will now come unanimously to the conclusion that the course we have taken ought to be approved, and that they will consent to the Motion.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved, "That this House will tomorrow, at nine of the clock in the evening, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*

CIVIL SERVICES, 1902-3 (ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE).

Ordered, That the Additional Estimate, presented 3rd November, be referred to the Committee of Supply.—(*Mr. Hayes Fisher.*)

WAYS AND MEANS.

"Resolved, That this House will to-morrow, at nine of the clock in the evening, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 11:-

(11.8.) Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or fail to provide such additional public school accommodation as is in the opinion of the Board of Education necessary.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put, and agreed to.

Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. M'KENNA said that before allowing the Clause to stand part of the Bill, the Committee should get an explanation as to whether the proposal to proceed by *mandamus* could under the circumstances prove satisfactory. He should, therefore, be glad of a statement from the Attorney General as to the power of the Court under a *mandamus* to compel the local authority to carry out such a general order as the provision of sufficient school accommodation.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the case would be analogous to that of the Public Health Act, where there was a provision for compelling the public health authority to exercise the powers of the Act. The order under the Section would be in specific form, such as the Board of Education deemed necessary, and the Court would be asked to enforce the direction of the Board of Education making an order. If this should be disobeyed, the recalcitrant individuals might be proceeded against, and made liable in person or property.

MR. BRYCE asked whether under the Clause, taken with Clause 12, the *mandamus* would lie against the local authority or the education committee. The committee would be, in the first instance, the party who would make default, and he should like the views of the Attorney General on that point.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said if he were to enter into details on that question, he would be anticipating the discussion upon Clause 12. The question of the right hon. Gentleman involved another question, and that was what would be the precise relations between the education committee and the local education authority. If the education committee were merely to be the creature of the local education authority, then, undoubtedly, the *mandamus* would be directed against the education authority; but if, on the other hand, the education Committee had come independent of the statutory power conferred on them, the answer might be different. Until the Committee had settled Clause 12 he did not think a more definite answer could be given.

MR. BRYCE said he asked the question on the basis of Clause 11 as it stood. The Attorney General was the proper exponent of the meaning of the Clause; and he was obliged to ask for an interpretation of it now, as vital Amendments to Clause 12 might be closured.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if the right hon. Gentleman would second the Government in their earnest desire to get on with the Bill, he need be under no misapprehension as to an opportunity being given for the discussion of important points in Clause 12.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that if the Government proposal in Clause 12 stood and the work was deputed to be done through or by a committee, that Committee would have to have a continuing statutory existence. What they wanted to know was how the remedy of *mandamus* could possibly be applicable to a continuing indisposition on the part of that Committee to carry out the Act. An Act of that complicated character could not be enforced in all its points, when the only remedy was a *mandamus*.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he wished to ask if they were to regard the answer of the Attorney General as an undertaking from the Government that they had an open mind with reference to Clause 12.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A quite open mind.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that then it would be open to the Committee to discuss, without any forcible abbreviation of their time, whether the education committee should be independent of the local authority.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said the statement of the Government that they had an open mind with reference to Clause 12 was a most important one; and he would ask whether, considering that statement, they should proceed with the discussion of Clause 12 at that late hour and open up a new chapter in the Bill. Would it not be wiser to come with fresh minds to its consideration tomorrow.

MR. LOUGH said there was one point about Clause 11 which he wished to put to the First Lord of the Treasury. The object of the Clause was to provide power to enforce the carrying out of the duties to be conferred under the Act, and his objection was that the Clause did not provide such power. The words of the Clause were entirely restricted to the local education authority, but there were other persons who would have new duties under the Act. Therefore, he thought that the Prime Minister or the Attorney General might consider whether power similar to the power in Clause 11 should not be provided in some other part of the Bill against the boards of management would be set up. Before the Clause passed from the ken of the Committee that aspect of it ought to be considered.

He agreed with his hon. friend that a *mandamus* was not a suitable way of dealing with cases where there was a neglect of duty on the part of the local authority.

MR. CHANNING said that the First Lord of the Treasury at an earlier stage had expressed his readiness to provide, in some part of the Bill, a means of enforcing a guarantee that the other persons who might undertake to provide a school should carry out their undertaking, and do so without unreasonable delay. He thought he was, therefore, entitled to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would now give some indication of where and in what way such a proposal would be introduced into the Bill guaranteeing the community against fraudulent and unfair proposals, which might conceivably be made under the Bill as it stood, and which the right hon. Gentleman himself frankly and fairly admitted was an evil which ought to be met. He wished to know how such unfair transactions on the part of private providers of schools would be dealt with.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE asked whether it would be in order to discuss on Clause 12 the power to compel the education authority to carry out its duties by a *mandamus*.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reply of the Attorney General was that that depended on the relations which would be established between the local authority and the education committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The *mandamus* will lie against the responsible persons.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said that the answer of the First Lord of the Treasury meant nothing at all. The right hon. Gentleman said that the *mandamus* would lie against the persons responsible, but that begged the question as to who would be the persons responsible. [MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Quite so.] As he understood it, the intention of the Clause was to provide certain powers for enforcing duties to be given to certain persons or bodies under the Act, but such powers should be given with reference to every person who would have duties under the Act. He was not sure whether the managers of denominational schools would have duties under the Act. Probably their position would be that they had privileges without any particular duties; but if any duties were to be imposed on them, they too ought to be dealt with in the Clause before the Committee. It was proposed under Clause 12 that the education authority was to act through an education committee, but it was essential, before they provided for compulsion, that they should know what were to be the relations between the local authority and the education committee. Otherwise they would be entirely at sea. He thought the Committee did not quite appreciate what a *mandamus* meant. The Education Department could not issue a *mandamus*. Someone would have to commence an action in the High Court for a *mandamus* to compel the persons who had duties to perform to exercise them. He appreciated the vagueness of the Clause quite as much as the Prime Minister, and he was not at all sure that vagueness was not the object of the

Government; but he felt quite certain that they ought not to insert a provision compelling the performance of duties until they had fully defined what the duties were, and by whom they were to be carried out. Further, the Clause was too limited, as it only directed that the *mandamus* should issue against the local education authority, leaving everyone else who had duties to perform outside. He could not understand why they were asked to pass the Clause at all, until they knew what the relations between the local education authority and the education committee were to be. After the local education authority had appointed the education committee, so far as he could see they would have no other duty to perform. [AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed, agreed.] What was the hon. Member agreed about? He was trying to understand the Bill, and if the hon. Gentleman was able to throw any light upon it, he would be very willing to resume his seat. He maintained, however, that the Committee should not pass Clause 11 until they had discussed Clause 12.

(11.32.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 475.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, George Denison (York
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'sham

Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon Sir Frederick G.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norman, Henry
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

(11.43.) Question put accordingly, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 476.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, John Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachin
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ry S Edm'ds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W. J. H. Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edward M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall

Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brown,George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne,Rt. Hon.Charles Seale-
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norman, Henry
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(GlamorganGower
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Broadhurst and Mr. Samuel Evans.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

BANKERS (IRELAND) ACT REPEAL BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL (Lancashire, Mid) said that they ought to have some explanation of the Bill, all the more as the Irish Members were absent. If the Bill had the assent of the Irish Members, so far as he was concerned he would not object to the Second Reading; but he hoped that in a matter of that kind——

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 5*th November*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Uddingston; Dalziel; Ellesmere Port; Newarthill; Edinburgh; and Markinch; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Norwich; and Newcastle-under-Lyme; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Markinch; and Ellesmere Port; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Seaforth, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

FEES FOR BURIAL SERVICES IN PAROCHIAL CEMETERIES.

Petition from Woolwich for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Uddingston; Dalziel; Ellesmere Port; Newarthill; and Markinch; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS ACT, 1888.

Copy presented, of Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents' Rules, 1889 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 365.]

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Four Orders in Council, dated 3rd November, 1902, for holding Winter Assizes in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIES.

Copy presented, of Circular Despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December 1901, relative to the Parliamentary and Municipal and Local Representation of Trading Companies in the Colonies under responsible Government, and the replies thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2911 and 2912 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 584 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Dublin Sorting Office—Officials' Grievances.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that the recommendation of the Tweedmouth Commission, that officers employed on split duties should have nine clear hours in their own homes, has not yet been made generally effective in the Dublin Sorting Office; and whether he will consider the entire abolition of split duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that it has not hitherto been practicable for the whole of the sorting staff in Dublin to have an interval of nine clear hours in their own homes; but arrangements are in progress which, under ordinary circumstances, will, I hope, provide such an interval in all cases. The work necessitates two attendances in the day for the great majority of the officers, and no alteration in this respect can be made.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that in the Dublin Sorting Office this year officers called on to perform extra duty had in many cases to give a triple attendance commencing at 5 a.m. and ending at 8 p.m.; whether with such attendances there were many instances of men being sent off duty receiving as remuneration for a day's work extending over 15 hours only 1 hour 30 minutes overtime, and that officers were called on to perform such duties on an average three times a week; and will he take steps to remedy the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that it has been necessary for the staff in the sorting office to give an additional, or third, attendance in certain emergencies; and in every case extra duty has been paid for in accordance with the regulations. Under the arrangements already mentioned it is hoped that a third attendance will be but seldom needed.

Dublin General Post Office Buildings—Sanitary Condition.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster General if he will state in the case of the Dublin General Post Office, which did not come within the scope of the corporation sanitary authorities, who was the recognised sanitary authority.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The Department has its own medical officer in Dublin, who would be consulted on any question as to the sanitary condition of the General Post Office buildings.

Betting Telegrams and Telegraphic Money Orders.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Postmaster General whether telegraph money orders are accepted by the Post Office containing instructions with reference to the making of bets; and whether the Postmaster General will take steps to prevent the telegraph service being used for gambling transactions.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Under the regulations relating to telegraph money orders the sender of an order by telegraph is allowed to have a private message added to the official telegram of advice. This private message takes the place of the separate telegram which the sender would otherwise have to forward, and it is sent in accordance with the ordinary rules regulating the transmission of telegrams. I am not able to discriminate between betting telegrams and other telegrams.

Telegraph Clerks and Betting Telegrams.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Postmaster General whether, seeing that telegraph clerks are subject to dismissal if it is discovered that they indulge in betting transactions, he will take steps to provide that telegraph clerks in receipt of 12s. per week to 30s. per week shall not be engaged in the transmission of telegrams containing sporting intelligence.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It would be quite impracticable to carry out the hon. Member's suggestion.

Lewis Local Government Board Inquiry.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the name of the Local Government Board's inspecting officer who visited the Island of Lewis for the purpose of inquiring into questions affecting the public health; what places he visited; and how many days, if any, he spent in the country districts, and how many in Stornoway.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham Murray.*) Mr. Millar, the Board's general superintendent of poor, and inspecting officer under the Public Health Act, arrived in Stornoway on the 20th May, and left for Harris on the 26th May. During the four working days of his presence in the Lews, he inspected the Poor Law administration of the parishes of Stornoway, Barvas, Lochs, and Uig; had interviews with the sanitary inspector and chief magistrate of Stornoway; and conferred with the medical officer of health, sanitary inspector, and officer of Naval Reserve on the subject of overcrowding. The 25th was Sunday. The distance driven in the course of Mr. Millar's visit to the Lews was about eighty miles.

Government Agreement with Cunard Company—Water-Tube Boilers.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether water-tube boilers exclusively, or a combination of cylindrical and water-tube boilers, is to be fitted into the new 25-knot vessels for the Cunard Company, or are the boilers to be of the cylindrical type alone.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The Admiralty have made no stipulation as to the type of boiler to be fitted in these vessels, and they have at present no information as to the type decided upon by the company.

Naval Departmental Committees.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can inform the House when the Reports of the various Committees on manning, reserves, the settlement of the engineer officer question, and as to the age of senior officers in command, may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is hoped that the Reports of the Committees appointed to deal with the question of manning and reserves, and with the system of promotion and retirement of officers, respectively, will be in the possession of the Admiralty before the end of the present year.

Phthisis in Cornish Mines—Home Office Inquiry.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, what is the nature of the inquiry into the health of Cornish miners which is now being conducted on behalf of the Home Office; when is the inquiry likely to be completed; and will the report of the inquiry be made public.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) The inquiry is being made by Dr. John Haldane, F.R.S., whose work in connection with mines is already well known. He will have the co-operation of Mr. Martin, His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, and such medical and scientific assistance as he may from time to time require. Dr. Haldane is now actively carrying on the inquiry, but it is impossible at present to say when it will be completed. I see no reason to doubt that the result of the inquiry will be published, though of course I cannot give any pledge on the subject at the present moment.

Scinde, Punjab, and Delhi Railway—Unclaimed Assets.

MR. CAINE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that there has been a sum of about £10,000 lying without interest at the Bank of England to the credit of the Scinde, Punjab, and Delhi Railway Company for the last twenty-one years; that in 1886 this undertaking was vested in the Government of India; that Section 54 of the Act provided for the eventual dissolution of the Company; that this Clause has been inoperative, the last surviving director having died; and that this deposit represents sums distributable, under Section 53 of the Act, between stockholders of the Company to parties who cannot be traced; and will be, therefore, to prevent this money becoming the property of the Bank of England by this failure of claimants, introduce a Bill causing this money to be paid over to the Paymaster General.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) I can add nothing to the answer given by my predecessor to a similar question addressed to him by the hon. Member on 13th March last†

Education Bill—Status of Organising Teachers.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education what, under the Education Bill, will be the status of those organisers appointed by the present School Board who control manual training, cookery, and laundry work, as well as those chosen to deal with kindred subjects.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Organising teachers employed by a School Board are officers of the Board within the meaning of rules (7), (8), and (9) of Schedule II. of the Bill. Their status will, therefore, be governed by those rules.

Home Charges on India.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the amount to be drawn from India during the present financial year for the home charges disbursed in this country, as compared with Rx.24,136,800 in the year 1898–9; the amount to be paid here by India in the present year under the head of military pensions and furlough charges, also civil and marine, as compared with Budget amounts for 1899–1900 Rx.7,138,600; the amount of the India Office salaries and establishment for this year as compared with the Rx.246,000 in the Budget 1899–1900; and the amounts to be paid by India for our diplomatic establishments in Persia and China as against the Rx.36,400 in 1899–1900.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, civ., 1268.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The amounts chargeable to Indian revenues under the heads mentioned in the Question, are as follows, in pounds sterling, at 1s. 4d. per rupee:—

	1898–9. £	1902–3. £
Total Net Home Charges - - - - - -	16,091,200	17,879,500
	1899–1900. £	
India Office, including Store Department and Auditor's Establishment - - - - - - -	161,400	161,800
Military Furlough and Civil and Military Pensions -	4,684,900	4,629,600
Diplomatic and Consular Establishment in Persia -	7,000	6,000
Ditto in China - - - - - - - -	12,500	Nil.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation—Expenses of International Scheme.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the fact that, under the International Scheme of North Sea Fisheries Investigation, Great Britain proposes to expend a sum of £42,000 during the next three years, inclusive of a sum of £1,250, this country's contribution for the maintenance of the central organisation at Copenhagen, will he state what sum each of the other countries concerned proposes to expend under this scheme of scientific investigation, exclusive of their contributions towards the maintenance of the central organisation?

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I gather from the *procès verbal* of the meeting of the International Council at Copenhagen that the sums proposed to be expended by the different countries in scientific investigations are as follows:—

Country.	Initial Expenditure.			Annual Expenditure.	
Denmark	— —	kroner 173,000	£9,600	kroner 100,000	£5,500
Germany	Steamer - - - - -	marks 330,000	£16,500	marks 125,000	£6,250
	Laboratories - - - - -	17,500	£875		
Holland	Instruments, etc. - - - -	florins 8,000	£666	florins 31,050	£2,587
Norway	Steamer - - - - - -	marks 190,000	£9,500	marks 147,000	£7,350
Sweden	— —	kroner 19,000	£1,055	kroner 19,200	£1,066
Russia	Steamer without equipment -	roubles 105,000	£16,000	roubles 81,000	£12,800
Finland	— —	Fin marks 151,000	£6,000	Fin marks 55,700	£2,228

In the case of Denmark and Russia it is not clear whether the amounts are exclusive of the contribution to the central organisation as in the case of the other countries named.

Transvaal Liquor Ordinance.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has yet received the full text of the New Liquor Regulations for the Transvaal; and, if so, will he issue them to the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The text of the Liquor Ordinance has not yet been received, but there will be no objection to publication when it arrives.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Repatriation of the Boers.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he has consulted with Lord Milner and can now give an estimate as to how much of the three million pounds granted for the rebuilding and restocking of the Boer farms at the signing of peace has been spent on the purposes for which it was granted.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): My right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary is unable to be here, and has asked me to read his answer. It is as follows:—"Upwards of £400,000 has been paid out of the Transvaal Treasury for repatriation purposes, and about £150,000 in the Orange River Colony. This is in addition to the cost of the animals and stores taken over from the military, which will amount to considerably over £1,000,000. Large additional contracts have also been entered into for cattle and supplies, but I am not able to state the exact amounts at present."

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Will the cost of the animals come out of the grant?

*MR. RITCHIE: It will be taken out of the funds placed at the disposal of Lord Milner.

MR. LOUGH: What use will be made of them?

*MR. RITCHIE: I presume they will be given to the Boers.

MR. LOUGH: That is what I want to get at.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies how much of the £3,000,000 free grant to burghers has been issued, upon what system has the grant been distributed, and what amounts have been spent upon seed corn, seed potatoes, horses, mules, oxen, implements, and expenses of administration.

*MR. RITCHIE (for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): In reply to the first part of this Question, I must refer the hon. Member to the answer given to the hon. Member for Chesterfield. Relief is being distributed to the burghers by local commissions appointed under Article 10 of the Terms of Surrender. I have no detailed information with regard to the points raised in the last part of the hon. Member's Question.

MR. LAMBERT: Are these grants to the burghers treated as loans or as free gifts? Can the right hon. Gentleman get me the information asked for in the latter part of the Question?

*MR. RITCHIE: The hon. Gentleman will understand that I am only answering for the Colonial Secretary. He must give notice of any further Question.

Civil Employment for Discharged Soldiers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House what steps have been taken and are being taken by the War Office to assist discharged reservists and time-expired men from the South African Campaign, including Imperial Yeomen, Militiamen, and Volunteers, to obtain civil employment.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Registers for civil employment are kept at the headquarters of regimental districts under the colonels commanding and at recruiting areas by recruiting staff officers. These officers are instructed to do all in their power to secure employment for the men whose names are on the registers. No men with characters less than "good" are so registered, and no men are recommended to employers unless there is reasonable hope that they will satisfy their employers. A leaflet has been given to every soldier who has returned from the war telling him where to register, and giving him advice on the subject of obtaining civil employment. Posters and leaflets have been sent to all large employers of labour, urging them to remember the strong claims of reservists and time-expired men who have come home from the war. I may perhaps mention that in view of statements which I have every reason to believe are exceedingly exaggerated as to the number of reservists and time-expired soldiers who have not received their pay, or who have not obtained their discharges, I have arranged to open a bureau at 47, Victoria Street, for a short period, and any soldier calling there after Monday morning, 10th instant, will receive immediate consideration of his case.

Rates of Wages at Woolwich Arsenal.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that workmen are employed by a contractor covering up steam pipes with patent covering in the Danger Buildings, Royal Laboratory, Woolwich Arsenal, at a rate of wages of 5½d. per hour, which is below the current rate of wages in the locality for similar work; and whether he will insist upon the contractor paying the current rate.

MR. BRODRICK: The firm who are engaged on the work state that they are paying 5½d. and upwards for pipe covering, and inquiry will be made as to whether this rate is below the current rate of the district.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the outside rate for general labour is 6d. and 6½d. per hour, according to the character of the work?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir, but I have said I will inquire.

Vaccination—Exemption Certificates.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of instances since the passing of The Vaccination Act, 1898, in which the justices or magistrates have declined to grant a certificate under the Conscience Clause of that Act, on the ground that the applicant had failed to satisfy them within the meaning of the Act; and will he state the number of certificates of exemption granted under the Conscience Clause of the Act.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S): I have no information as to the number of cases of the kind referred to in the first part of the Question. The number of certificates of conscientious objection actually received by Vaccination Officers down to the 30th June last was 331,438.

Loans Under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of applications for loans which have been made under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Local Government Board have received forty-four applications from local authorities in England and Wales for sanction to loans under the Act referred to. As regards London the County Council are empowered to sanction such loans, and I am informed that they have received one application.

Royal Commission on Alien Immigration.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade a Question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether he is aware that the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration has held no meeting since July, although the Commissioner of Police has reported to the Board of Trade that the number of foreign Jews in the East-end of London is increasing, and that the area inhabited by them is very largely extending.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am afraid I cannot add anything to the reply I gave my hon. and gallant friend the other day, to the effect that I have no sort of control over the proceedings of the

Royal Commission. I think if I were to address such a question to the Commission they might consider it an interference with their duties.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the chairman of the Royal Commission unable to continue the presidency of the Commission, and, if so, cannot another chairman be appointed?

[No answer was given.]

Stornoway Mail Service.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will state the names of the various steamers which Messrs. MacBrayne have employed for the conveyance of His Majesty's mails between Kyle of Lochalsh and Stornoway since the breakdown in the Minch of the mail steamer "Clydesdale" early in September last; is he aware that the thirty-five-years-old paddle steamer "Gael," formerly "Vixen," is now employed on this service; and will he state the speed of this boat and when and where she was last inspected.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E): Since the breakdown of the "Clydesdale" in September last the undermentioned steamers have conveyed the Mails between Kyle and Stornoway—"Clansman," "Lovedale," "Cavalier," "Glendale," and "Gael." The "Gael" performed the service from the 21st to the 28th of October, when she was replaced by the "Glendale," which has performed the service since the last mentioned date, except on the 30th of October when the "Gael" was again employed. The speed of the "Gael" is stated to be 15 knots an hour, and it is understood that she was last inspected at Glasgow, on January 7th, 1902. She was not formerly the "Vixen."

MR. WEIR: If the right hon. Gentleman will look at the shipping list he will see the "Gael" is described as formerly the "Vixen." Is he aware that her speed is not 15 knots but more likely 5?

[No answer was returned.]

Highland Deer Forests—Ben Wyvis Grazings.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that a portion of the grazings on the southern slope of Ben Wyvis, near Strathpeffer, Ross-shire, are about to be converted into deer forest; and, seeing that these grazings were formerly occupied by crofter tenants, will the Secretary for Scotland make some inquiry to ascertain whether it is possible to secure these grazings for the creation of crofters' holdings.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Secretary for Scotland regrets that he is unable to identify the grazings to which the hon. Member alludes. In any case, however, the slopes of Ben Wyvis do not appear to offer facilities for occupation by crofter tenants.

MR. WEIR: Does not the Lord Advocate intend to take any steps to prevent these devastations being carried out?

[No answer was returned.]

Island of Lewis—Landless Cottars.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that a number of cottars, fishermen, and other residents in the Island of Lewis have recently presented a petition to His Majesty setting forth that the depredations of steam trawlers, foreign and British, have rendered line fishing in the seas around the coast unremunerative, and that they are threatened with destitution; and, seeing that they assert that there are large tracts of land now practically waste from which the landless cottars could earn a living, will the Secretary for Scotland advise the Congested Districts Board to open negotiations with the proprietor of the Island of Lewis for the purpose of acquiring land with a view to ameliorate the condition of these people.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Secretary for Scotland is aware of the petition referred to. As I stated in reply to a similar Question on the 23rd

October, the Congested Districts Board do not at present think they can usefully open negotiations in Lewis of the kind suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. WEIR: And meanwhile the cottars are to starve!

Scottish Fishery Board Cruisers.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the announcement that H.M.S. "Jackal" is about to be laid up for repairs, will he state what cruisers will be placed at the disposal of the Scottish Fishery Board for sea police duties during the withdrawal of the "Jackal."

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed that H.M.S. "Jackal" is not about to be laid up for repairs.

Education Bill—Spending Powers of Education Committees.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether the spending powers of the Education Committees to be established under Clause 12 of the Education Bill are intended to be analogous to those of the Standing Joint Committees, as provided by Section 75 (16) (*f*) of The Local Government (England and Wales) Act, 1888; or whether the County Councils will be able to limit the amount of their expenditure, and to define the specific objects on which the money is to be spent.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I think that this Question could more conveniently be dealt with in discussion on the Clause itself.

Use of Foreign-made Pencils in Government Offices.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that lead pencils made in Germany and Austria have for years enjoyed almost a monopoly of the supply of this country; and, having regard to the quality of the pencils now made in London, whether His Majesty's Stationery Office will take care to give orders for pencils to the home manufacturers.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham): Some years ago nearly all pencils bought for the public service were of foreign origin, but the Stationery Office are now able, as a rule, to obtain English pencils which meet their requirements. During the financial year 1901–02 they purchased (including telegraph pencils and small quantities of fancy pencils) 5355 gross of cedar pencils of which all but 725 gross were of English make. Careful experiments were made a few years ago with regard to telegraph pencils, and it was found that those manufactured in England were either considerably dearer or less satisfactory than the present pencils which are obtained from a firm in London but manufactured in Germany.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Why are we not provided with English pencils here in this House?

MR. HAYES FISHER: I am not aware that the pencils here are of foreign origin, but I will make inquiries.

Irish Bankruptcy Procedure—Official Assignees' Appeals.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he will state what amount of official assignees' costs and expenses have been paid out of the unclaimed dividend account in the Bank of Ireland in cases where the official assignees have unsuccessfully appealed to the House of Lords consequent upon a reversal by the Court of Appeal in Ireland of a decision of the judge in the Bankruptcy Division of the High Court during the last year for which accounts are available; and whether the Government will take steps to prevent such accounts from being further depleted by similar actions of the official assignees in future.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): To the knowledge of the present official assignees in bankruptcy the only amount paid to the official assignees for costs and expenses of an unsuccessful appeal to the House of Lords was £1,006 9s. 6d. paid to them over seven years ago in indemnification of costs in *re* Peel, a bankrupt. This sum was paid in pursuance of Section 85 of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act of 1877 out of moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose. The appeal was taken under the advice of Senior Counsel, both in England and Ireland, and on the authority of an Order of the late Court of Bankruptcy made in 1894.

Recruiting for the Royal Irish Constabulary.

* MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state under what circumstances a young man named John O'Donnell, residing near Westport, was refused admission as a recruit to the Royal Irish Constabulary; what was the nature of the application of him and his father; and what was the report of the medical officer who examined him.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Owing to the popularity of the Royal Irish Constabulary the number of candidates for admission to the Force is always largely in excess of the vacancies. I cannot undertake to trace individuals from among the large number who are necessarily disappointed.

* MR. TULLY: Did not this man and his father apply to the local sergeant of police in 1888, and was he not medically examined by the local doctor?

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member wishes to urge that the man was improperly refused, and in such a way as to prejudice his future, I may say at once I think it is a matter with which I can deal.

Labourers (Ireland) Act.

* MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from the Boyle No. 2 District Council a resolution complaining that the amount of the supplemental loan sanctioned by the Treasury under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts has not been issued by the Board of Works; and whether, as the contractors, who have got final certificates from the engineer for their work, are now threatening legal proceedings for the balance due to them, he will direct that this loan shall be issued by the Board of Works without further delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners of Public Works are not responsible for any delay that has taken place in the issue of this loan. The District Council has not yet furnished a conveyance of some of the land required, and until this has been done the mortgage deed securing the loan cannot be completed.

Irish M.P.'s and Hard Labour.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many Members of Parliament are now in prison under hard labour sentences; what complaints as to their treatment have been made to the visiting justices, the governor, and the medical officer; and what modifications of the prison rules have been made in consequence of these complaints.

* MR. WYNDHAM: One Member of Parliament, namely, the hon. Member for North Longford. He has made no complaints of the nature indicated, and no modifications of the prison rules have been made in consequence. Upon grounds of health, however, and on the recommendation of the medical officer, considerable relaxations in the rules have been made.

Belfast Borough Accounts.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the auditor's Report on the Belfast Borough Accounts was not published in any newspaper, and was not circulated amongst the members of the Council; whether this Report contained any references to the manner in which certain officials discharged their duties; and whether the Local Government Board will insist on the former practice of publishing these Reports being complied with.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board is unable to say whether the Report was published or circulated. The Board has no power to require the publication of such Reports. The Local Government Bill, now before the House, contained a provision enabling the Board to make rules concerning the publication of Auditors' Reports. This provision, however, was dropped.

MR. TULLY: As this provision—a very useful one—was dropped in a hurry and without due consideration, will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to reinstate it in the Bill?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will consider that on the Report stage.

Irish Census Returns.

MR. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why the Census Returns for the counties Armagh, Antrim, and Tipperary are not yet issued though the Census Commission was closed on 30th June; is there any reason why these counties are withheld; and, if not, will he say when the Returns may be expected.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Census Book for Tipperary has been issued. There has been some delay in the issue of the volumes for Antrim and Armagh, but it is hoped these will be published in a few days.

St. Mary's National School, Drogheda.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a complaint from the Rev. John Curry, Drogheda, that, owing to the interpretation of the new rules by the Commissioners of National Schools, the head teacher of St. Mary's National School, Drogheda, has been subjected to a loss of £50 a year in his income as teacher; and whether it is proposed to refund this sum and to reconsider the payments of teachers and assistant teachers similarly circumstanced.

MR. WYNDHAM: A communication has been received from the Rev. Mr. Curry and is at present under consideration.

Dr. Starkie and Irish Primary School Managers.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the resolutions passed by the Roman Catholic clerical managers of national schools in three-fourths of Ireland referring to the statements made by Dr. Starkie, Resident Commissioner of National Education, recently in Belfast, against the managers of primary schools; whether it is proposed to hold any public inquiry into these matters; and if he can state what action the Government propose to take.

MR. WYNDHAM: Some resolutions have reached me. The Resident Commissioner informs me that he has seen resolutions from Roman Catholic Managers which show that they are under the mistaken impression that he referred to them solely. That is not the case nor, in his opinion, do his words justify such an inference. I do not propose to hold a public inquiry. A small Committee was recently appointed to consider the whole question of building grants for school houses. No further action seems necessary.

MR. TULLY: Was not Dr. Starkie's speech as blazing an indiscretion as General Buller's speech? Why was he not retired in the same way?

Irish Local Government Report.

MR. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why the Local Government Board have failed to index their annual report the same as is done in England; and will he give instructions to have this done in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Report contains a Table of Contents classified with great care and on the same lines as the Table in the Scotch Report. The preparation of an alphabetical index would, I am afraid, delay the publication of the Report; however, I will inquire further into the matter.

MR. TULLY: Surely an index is as much required in the Irish as in the English Report.

Education Bill – Transferred Denominational Schools.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will state whether the schools originally built as denominational schools, but which have been transferred to and are at present managed by School Boards, will become, at the expiration of the lease regulating their transfer, new public elementary schools provided by other persons, and will be subject to the provisions of Clause 9 of the Education Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have answered this Question already very fully on October 27. If the hon. Gentleman wishes me to repeat the answer I will do so, but I hope this may be the final edition. What I said was that "At the end of such a lease as that contemplated by the hon. Gentleman in his Question the buildings would revert absolutely to the lessors—that is to say, the trustees or the managers of the voluntary school. But if it is desired to use these buildings as a denominational school, this would be a new school and would come under the provision of Clauses 9 and 10 of the Bill."

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): May I ask whether, having regard to the fact that the effect will be to turn a considerable number of board schools into voluntary schools, the right hon. Gentleman will give an opportunity of discussing this question before the Committee stage of the Education Bill is over.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman's premises I need hardly say I do not follow him in his conclusions.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: The point really is whether the trustees, when the buildings revert to them, will have to make a delegation at the time the school is reconstituted as a public elementary school.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say what will be done under the trust deeds unless I see them. There is an immense variety of them, and I cannot answer a question of that sort.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to prevent a hiatus in point of time between the expiry of the present powers and the commencement of the new powers?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should be delighted to prevent any hiatus, but I do not know that the present Bill will cause one. There might be a hiatus possible under the existing system, and there might be one under the new system, but the new system will do nothing to increase any hiatus.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what the business will be tomorrow and Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Tomorrow afternoon and on Friday the Education Bill will be taken. This evening and tomorrow evening will be devoted to the financial proceedings in connection with the Vote in Supply for the Transvaal. If I get the Vote tonight I shall take Report tomorrow. The Education Bill will be the second Order tomorrow evening.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I wish to ask whether, in view of the importance of the question raised by the Supply, the right hon. Gentleman will not give an afternoon for Supply and take the evening for education; or, if he cannot do that, whether he will endeavour to insure during the discussion of Supply the presence of an adequate number of Members in the House.

MR A. J. BALFOUR: I hope an adequate number of Members will attend; but I think it will be very inconvenient unnecessarily to interrupt the discussion on the Education Bill. It must be interrupted on Monday next.

STANDING ORDER 25, CLOSURE OF DEBATE—NOTICE OF MOTION.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) gave notice that whenever he found an opportunity he would call attention to Standing Order 25, Closure of Debate, to the mode in which it had been applied, and to the necessity that had recently been made manifest of so altering its terms as effectually to secure that which was supposed to be one of the conditions of its use—namely, that there should be no infringement of the rights of a minority in debate, particularly when called upon to consider Clauses of Bills in Committee.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Tenth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 12:—

(2.35.) LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) moved an Amendment to substitute for the first two words of the Clause, "Any council," the words "The local education authority." He knew, he said, it was very inconvenient to hand in an Amendment in writing, as he had done in this case, but he thought hon. Gentlemen would see that it had been done out of no desire to prolong the discussion. His reason for moving it was that in the Technical Instruction Acts, which were about to be repealed, the delegation or transfer of powers was dealt with in the manner he proposed. The machinery of those Acts was now quite familiar to the bodies who had the working of it; various points raised by it had been decided by the Law Courts or by correspondence with the Board of Education, and it would be well to retain the machinery. Last night, at a very late hour, some exceedingly important Amendments were placed on the Paper by the Government in the direction of taking the Technical Instruction Acts and their machinery of delegation, as a model, rather than the Lunacy Act, and he suggested that the Amendment would give the Government a convenient opportunity of explaining what was the new scheme they were going to propose. There were many hon. Members who were actually unaware that these Amendments had been placed on the Paper, and he must confess he could not see why the Government should not at a much earlier stage, have indicated that it was their intention to make these large alterations. He would be the last person to criticise them because, as far as he could make out, the Government had adopted nearly the whole of the Amendment he had placed on the Paper with regard to that matter, but he was inclined to think that the discussion would have been greatly shortened had the Amendments been placed on the Paper earlier. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out the first two words 'any council' and insert the words 'the local education authority.'"—(*Lord E. Fitzmaurice.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Any council' stand part of the clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY) said the reason for the words used in the Clause was, that there were certain cases of boroughs of under 10,000, and urban districts of under 20,000 inhabitants, where there were concurrent powers which would have to be exercised under this Act, but where the body exercising those powers was not the local education authority. They used the words "Any council" in order to include these cases. As to the other point raised by the noble Lord, his hon. friend would deal with that when his Amendment was reached.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) thought they might, before commencing the discussion of the most important Clause, have an explanation from the Government of the changes they were going to make. There was a conversation on that point just before they rose last night, and no hint was then given that the Bill was going to be completely changed. So far as he understood the changes he was favourable to them, but it was due to the Committee that there should be an explanation at the very commencement of the discussions on the Clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The question will arise on the first Amendment which stands in the name of the Secretary to the Board of Education.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Yes, but we shall then have passed words of the Clause which we might wished to have altered. We ought not to commence discussing the Clause without knowing the complete scheme of the Government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said that so far as he knew there was in no quarter any desire to do otherwise than assist the Committee in understanding what the new scheme of the Government was. He thought it would be very much better that the explanation should be given before they entered on the consideration of the Clause. They did not at present know to what extent the adoption of the first few words would be consistent with the new scheme. After all, it was a matter of courtesy that they were asking at the hands of the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the last thing the Government desired to be lacking in was courtesy. It was a question of convenience. If the noble Lord withdrew his Amendment they could at once come to an Amendment which truly raised the question in regard to which an explanation was desired. He thought that would be the most convenient course, but still he was quite willing that the statement should be made now.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said the words "any council" raised some important points relating to other parts of the Clause. He wished to ask whether the small local authorities would have to go through all the trouble of framing a scheme exactly as the County Council had to proceed. He objected to compelling them to do so, and had supposed that the intention of the Government was to leave the smaller authorities the powers they had at the present time. They ought not to pass these words until they knew whether the Government intended to alter the constitution and methods of these small authorities.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he understood the proposal was that his hon. friend should make a statement by leave of the Committee, but everyone could not discuss that statement by the leave of the Committee. He thought it would be more regular to dispose of the Amendment. Then the statement could be made and discussed by everybody.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) asked whether it was to be understood that the machinery proposed was to be inapplicable to the smaller authorities.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought that was implied.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said the observations of the Attorney General showed that the Amendment was one of substance, and it gave the Government an opportunity of making a statement of their policy. What was really proposed was that councils of non-county boroughs and urban districts, who had no powers except for the purposes of education other than elementary, should nevertheless be subject to these schemes. He hoped the Government would make their statement now. It would be entirely in order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not assent to have the discussion on this Amendment and then go over it all again on the Amendment of his hon. friend. He was ready to come to some arrangement.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN thought the right hon. Gentleman misunderstood what they were asking. There was no desire to have the discussion on the Government proposals on this Amendment. What they desired was to be enlightened as to the character of the new proposals. The notice was placed on the Paper only at a late hour last night, and he thought it was only due to the Committee that they should have the Government statement now.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that so long as the statement was not to be discussed now it was nothing to them whether that statement was made at once, or on the Amendment to be proposed later by his hon. friend.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said what they wanted to know was the view of the Government as to the Clause as a whole. Were the Councils in these small areas to be compelled to appoint a Committee within the next twelve months, and if they failed to do so, would the Board of Education have power to step in and by Provisional Order appoint one to carry out duties which might not require to be undertaken for many years to come? How far did the Government scheme alter that position? He did not wish to pronounce any opinion on the point of procedure, but the Committee would be at great difficulty in discussing the Clause unless they first had a bird's-eye view of the remodelled scheme. Surely the Government might, in a few words, indicate the changes they were prepared to make in the Clause.

*(2.55.) THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said he understood that he was expected to make a statement as to the intentions of the Government with regard to the framing of the Clause without its now being discussed. His first Amendment was to omit the words "in the exercise of," in order to substitute the word "having." The result would be that, with the addition of another Amendment which immediately followed, the Clause would run thus:—

> "Any Council having powers under this Act shall establish an Education Committee, or Education Committees, constituted in accordance with a scheme made by the Council and approved by the Board of Education."

The Committee would observe that the reference to the rating powers was left out at this point but would reappear in the Amendment which stood farther down in his name as follows—

> "All matters relating to the exercise by the Council of their powers under this Act shall stand referred to the Education Committee, and the Council, before exercising any such powers, shall consider the Report (if any) of the Education Committee with respect to the matter in question. The Council may also delegate to the Education Committee, with or without any restrictions or conditions as they think fit, any of their powers under this Act, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money."

There could be no doubt that these Amendments would effect a distinct modification in the scheme of the relations of the Council to the Committee as they appeared in the Bill before the Committee. There was no doubt, also, that as these debates had gone on it had become plain that there was a desire in the House and in the country that the local education authority which it was proposed to establish should be an authority popularly elected and directly responsible to the ratepayers. The Government desired that it should be so. This body would have, in spite of all that might be said in its disparagement, great powers, and the Government believed that it would exercise those powers in a manner salutary to the education of the country; but they wished that it should be a popularly chosen body the Council of a county or of a borough, which should be entrusted with powers in all matters relating to education within its area. The objects of his Amendments were to make that point quite clear.

He would state what he conceived the relations between these two bodies would be. The local education authority would not act through a Committee, but it would be bound to ask the advice of the Committee. If the Committee did not advise at all, if it were unwilling to advise or incapable of advising, or if its advice—as might sometimes happen, though he believed that such instances would be very rare—should not be such as the Council thought it desirable to follow, the local education authority would act either without the advice of the Committee or contrary to it; but in any case the local education authority would be the body that would act in the matter. It might be contended that in the larger areas difficulties and delays would be occasioned if the local education authority had in every case to await the advice of its consultative committee. The Government proposed to meet that by giving very extensive powers of delegation, the amount of power delegated to be determined from time to time by the local authority, and the powers delegated to be liable at any moment to modification or withdrawal. But to these powers of delegation the Government made one very important exception. The local education authority was not to be able to delegate its power of raising a rate or of borrowing money. The executive power necessarily rested with the local education authority—the Council, and the financial power must rest with it under the provisions of the Bill; but the powers of delegation, with the exception of its financial power, would be regulated by the Council's own convenience and what it conceived to be the educational requirements of its area.

He would not trouble the Committee with any constitutional comparison of the relations between this Committee and the Council and those of other Committees and other Councils. What concerned the Committee was not how this Education Committee would compare with the Watch Committee or the Standing Joint Committee and their respective Councils, but what the Government meant to do in respect of the Councils of which this Committee was the constitutional adviser. What he wished to impress upon the Committee was that the popularly chosen body was and would be supreme, but that it could delegate most of its powers, with the exception of its financial powers.

The one other point was as to the intention of the Government in respect of the composition of the Committee. The Council was to choose or appoint a majority, but it might appoint that majority from its own body, or it might not. The Government would be prepared to throw upon the Council the burden of deciding whether it would not appoint a majority of members of its own body by introducing words, making it necessary that the Council should appoint a majority of members of its own body u less it expressly determined not to do so. He would not go further into the schemes which would be submitted by the various Councils to the Education Department. No doubt much discussion might take place when the Committee came to consider the necessary provisions of those schemes. What he desired to impress upon the Committee—and he hoped he had made it sufficiently clear—was that the Council was to be the local education authority, and that the Education Committee was to consist of a majority of persons chosen by the Council, and primarily, unless specially determined otherwise, from members of its own body. The Committee could now discuss the noble Lord's Amendment, and when his own Amendment came to be considered much of the explanation he had now given would be no longer necessary.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) asked whether the small boroughs were to be compelled to appoint an Education Committee. In his own constituency there were two small boroughs of about 3,000 inhabitants which would be compelled under this scheme to appoint an Education Committee with all the paraphernalia of submitting schemes to the Board of Education, and so forth. That, surely, was not the wish of the Government. If, therefore, words could be introduced to prevent such an occurrence, it would relieve the minds of those who represented small boroughs. It would certainly be absurd to appoint Committees which would perhaps have no work to do, and which, even if they did work, would do so in contravention of the wish of the Government, and would infringe the work of the County Council.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the reason why these words—which undoubtedly included small as well as large boroughs—had been introduced was, that the Government confidently expected that those boroughs would work in with the County Council so far as their own work was concerned. Such co-operation would probably be much easier between the Education Committee of the county authority and the Education Committee of the small borough than by direct negotiations between the boroughs and the County Councils.

MR. LAMBERT: But supposing the small boroughs do not wish to take any action at all ?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would not be any serious burden; there is no cost.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said the answer of the Attorney General had undoubtedly shown that there was substance as well as drafting in the Amendment which he had moved with the feeling that it was one the Government would probably accept. All he desired to do was to bring the first words of the Clause into harmony with the local education authority as defined in Clause 1, being under the impression that the Government intended that the only real education authorities should be those mentioned in that Clause. He admitted that he was one of those who pressed on the Government the claims in regard to a certain limited class of questions, of the smaller boroughs and Urban Councils, but he certainly never contemplated that the smaller authorities should blossom forth in the full dignity of local education authorities. It now appeared, however, that the Government intended Clause 3—the drafting of which would have to be reconsidered on Report—to be pressed to the full extent of recognising these smaller authorities as the local education authorities for all purposes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE: At any rate for a great number of purposes.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: For the purposes of Clause 3, as amended.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE was convinced that the County Councils Association only desired to save the rating power possessed by these small places under the Technical Instruction Acts, and which had been found to be most useful. It never entered their minds that they should be the local education authority. If the Government meant more than he had supposed, they had a good reason for rejecting the Amendment, but his idea in moving it was that the Government wished to make only the County, and the County Borough Councils local education authorities, and that, therefore, they would be able to accept his proposal.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that since the Bill was originally drafted, an important alteration had been made in Clause 3, and the words had a much extended meaning. The substantial question arose of whether every small borough, whether it intended to exercise its powers under Clause 3 or not, should have imposed upon it the obligation of appointing an Education Committee. It was essential that such an obligation should be put upon every local education authority, but surely in the case of these small boroughs it might be optional. Many small towns were willing enough to contribute a certain amount of money to meet money provided by the central authority for the purposes of certain institutions within their own borders, but it was quite unnecessary to put them under this obligation.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) was inclined to support the Government as against the noble Lord, although the Amendment undoubtedly had much to be said for it. The Government had placed themselves in the present difficulty by not really facing on Clause 3 the question of the relative position of the smaller areas to the county in respect of secondary education. If they intended to adhere to the position as laid down in Clause 3, what had fallen from the First Lord of the Treasury was the logical outcome of the situation. He thought, however, there was a third and much wiser course. Could not the Government, even now, with regard to these smaller areas, devise a subordinate local autonomy suited to the exercise of certain limited powers with regard to both elementary and secondary education? If the Government would face the problem of bringing these smaller areas into logical co-ordination with the work of the County Councils, and in some way secure autonomy with regard to both branches of education, they would effect a material improvement in the Bill.

MR. BRYCE said that he had been much impressed by what had been said by the First Lord of the Treasury, that it might be desirable where these authorities were willing to rate themselves with other boroughs or counties to have a combined scheme, and that might have the effect of putting a larger sum at the disposal of the joint authority for educational work. If this view were accepted the best course to adopt would be to follow out the suggestion of the hon. Member for East Somerset, and accept the Amendment moved by the noble Lord to insert a proviso which would enable these minor areas, where they proposed to rate themselves, and where there was a prospect of union, to ask the Board of Education to give them a Committee, and allow them to enter into the joint scheme of action which the right hon. Gentleman contemplated. He hoped the Government would consider that suggestion.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) hoped that at some other stage of the Bill the Government would take some steps to bring about a union of these small areas. He was perfectly certain that the working of the authorities for these small areas would not be satisfactory. They were deficient in money, and had not sufficient influence to command efficient service, and they laboured under all those disadvantages and disabilities which belonged to minor authorities. It would be far more satisfactory if this Clause was confined to the larger authorities. It would be far better to achieve this result by direct action now, instead of leaving it to some small authority which would take considerable time, and delay the operation of the Bill.

*(3.20.) SIR CHARLES DILKE said he was not quite sure what kind of parishes would be included under Clause 3. There were a large number which had been made urban districts, but which were in fact small rural parishes. These small parishes were familiar to some hon. Members, for they were very thick in some counties, although in others they did not exist at all. These small parishes ought not to be brought under machinery of this kind, because the thing would have to be a dead letter, or else those parishes would be put to a large expense which they were quite unable to undertake.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said what he understood from the discussion was that where the authority had control of elementary as well as higher education, they ought to establish a committee there, but where the authority had only control of elementary education this proposal should not touch it. It did seem ridiculous that they should be compelled to establish a committee which might not get to work for a very long time. Where there was one single authority fully constituted, it should be made compulsory to form a committee, but in the case of the small parishes they should not be compelled to set up committees until they found it was necessary. If it were merely a question of providing an extra £50 or £100 he could understand the County Council saying "We will give you so much if you will provide the remainder." Was there any necessity to establish a committee in a case of this description, whereas if they were to undertake more extended operations they could establish a committee for that purpose. He suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that he should carry out his original idea. This difficulty had arisen over the acceptance of an Amendment. Let them have for the large areas the one authority acting through its committee and in the supplementary areas let them have power to appoint a committee, or leave it alone, according to the needs of the locality.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said they had introduced under the Bill over 800 small parishes, each of which would be compelled to send a scheme up to the Education Department for the constitution of an authority. He thought the suggestion made by the hon. Member for North West Ham was a happy way out of the difficulty. If under Clause 3 as modified they had no power over elementary education, and could only spend up to an extra penny they ought not to be compelled to set up a scheme for the control of higher education upon which they might not be spending any money for years.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there appeared to be no difference of opinion in regard to the principle of this proposal on this or the other side of the House. They were all agreed that they must have a Committee in every case where elementary education was concerned, for they could not work the Bill without one. He thought they were all agreed that there probably were cases in which the Borough Council was not the authority for elementary education, where it would nevertheless be desirable that they should be. He confessed that upon this subject he had been impressed by the arguments which had fallen from hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House. He agreed that in some cases the proposal was almost too elaborate for the trifling purposes for which it would be used. He was disposed to think that the case would be met by the suggestion of the hon. Member for North West Ham, which left sufficient latitude to the authorities to appoint these Committees where it was desirable, and left it optional where it was not desirable that they should be appointed.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said they ought to be informed whether the Government thought it was advisable or necessary that these small places should have any Committee at all. He agreed with the hon. Member for North West Ham in regard to confining the operation of this Clause to districts and boroughs already created as authorities for elementary education as well as secondary education. The Prime Minister agreed that the appointment of these committees ought not to be made compulsory upon these small bodies, and it was worth while considering whether they ought to have this power at all, because it would encourage the establishment of committees for which no reason could be alleged. In many cases a committee was not necessary, because they could entrust the work to sub-committees of the larger bodies. He did not think it was necessary to give even permissive powers to these small places.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said the suggestion of the hon. Member for North West Ham was in accordance with suggestions which had been made from this side of the House, and they would accept it.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The words proposed by the hon. Member for North West Ham express, I think, in a general sense what the Committee is disposed to agree to. At the same time I think difficulty may arise on the words, because if you state that any Council having powers under Part III. of the Act shall appoint a committee, it might be said that the inference is that the committee appointed is solely with reference to the powers to be exercised under Part III. I think it is desirable that it should be made very clear, and what I would suggest is that it would be better dealt with by a proviso—I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen made a suggestion of that kind—at a subsequent stage for carrying into effect what the hon. Member for North West Ham has suggested.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR hoped the Committee would now go on to the next Amendment. They were all agreed on the substance of what was suggested.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE: What course does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take with regard to the Amendment?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: It will be dealt with by a proviso afterwards.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he was not at all sure that the Committee were agreed as to the substance, but as the matter would be discussed afterwards he would not go into it now.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out the words 'in the exercise of,' and insert the word 'having.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'in the exercise of' stand part of the Clause."

MR. WHITLEY said he wished to point out how the change proposed by the Government affected the question the Committee had just been discussing. The change would bring about the difficulty they wished to avoid. If the words "in the exercise of" were left in the Clause, the question the Government had just now undertaken to deal with would be very much simplified, because it would not be necessary then for every one of the smaller Councils to appoint a committee and to apply for a scheme until they had begun to exercise powers other than rating powers.

Question put and negatived.

Question, "That the word 'having' be there inserted," put and agreed to.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) moved to leave out "shall" and insert "may" in line 27. He said that some of his objections to the compulsory word "shall" would be taken away if he was right in thinking that the Government, by the rather complicated Amendment which would be proposed later on, really meant that the County Council was to be absolutely its own master. Reference was made to the Standing Joint Committee, but the Parliamentary Secretary did not say whether it was the intention of the Government that there should be a similar committee for education. He understood that the committee referred to in the Clause was to be under the control of the County Council, and that the County Council should have absolute control over its constitution. He asked the Government what was their objection to leaving it to the discretion of the County Council to appoint, or not to appoint, an education committee as they should see fit. There might be cases where a County Council or a small Borough Council would think it unnecessary to appoint a committee. It appeared to him that the Government had modified their scheme in such a way as to show absolute distrust of the County Councils. Clause 4 of the Bill provided that the Board of Education might hold, if they thought fit, a local inquiry to find out whether the scheme proposed by a County Council or Town Council was one approved of by the locality. That seemed very curious indeed. Looking to the general scheme of the Bill, there was no doubt that the object of the Government was to make the County Council the creature of the Education Department. The representatives of the Government talked in this House of decentralisation, and of making the system of education suited to the different localities, but when the Bill was examined it seemed perfectly certain that the Board of Education were to be the real masters. It might be that the Board of Education would insist upon a scale of salaries to be paid to the teachers. He thought it would be satisfactory if they had a Schedule to the Bill showing what was to be done by the Board of Education. As the Bill stood, the Board of Education might make any rule they liked, and force up the local rate to any extent. No doubt they had got some power, but if the County Council objected, all that the Board of Education had to do was to sit tight for twelve months, then send down to the County Council their scheme, and order it to be carried out. His argument was that they should trust the County Councils in this matter and put in "may" instead of "shall," so as to allow them to act as a body if they liked.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 27, to leave out the word 'shall' in order to insert the word 'may.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

* SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he was afraid it was very difficult to relieve some hon. Gentlemen opposite from the pressure of the nightmare under which they laboured in regard to this Bill. They thought that the Bill was designed entirely with a view of hampering and embarrassing the local authority, and that it was inspired by a distrust of the local authority in every direction, and with the desire to work everything under the control of the Board of Education; while the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board was a sort of ghostly enemy to education, lying in ambush everywhere to thwart the educational ambitions of every locality. The hon. Gentleman in the first place said that it was a great insult to the County Councils that their schemes should be published, and that there should be public inquiry in regard to them before they were approved by the Board of Education. There were different kinds of inquiry conducted by various Departments, and he had never heard that any local authority had considered itself aggrieved or insulted by these inquiries. Then, as to leaving it optional to the local authority to appoint the committee, the hon. Gentleman forgot

that the committee would be the humble servants of the local authority. Again, County Councils were not elected specially for educational matters, and some of them might not be the best authorities on education. It was, therefore, desirable that the local authority should be assisted by the advice of persons of experience in education, and acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area for which the Councils acted, and that it should be incumbent upon them to appoint a committee or committees. Moreover, there were various persons, women in particular, who could not sit on Municipal Councils, and if the Amendment was adopted they would be left out of all consideration and have no voice in the educational affairs of the area. For that reason alone, unless the hon. Member wished to exclude finally from all consideration those persons who took a deep interest in education, this Amendment was hardly worthy of consideration. How would the committee be the masters of the local authority, and not the servants, when, if their action was not approved by the local authority, their appointment might be revoked?

(3.53.) MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) hoped that his hon. friend would not press his Amendment to a division, or if he did he would vote against it. Parliament was throwing a large amount of extra work on those Councils, and nearly all of them would devolve the educational work on committees. In this matter of education it was necessarily most important that the local authorities should avail themselves of the help of outsiders, and particularly of the assistance of women, whose help had been in the past so important. Then there were some local authorities who would not avail themselves of the option, because they did not want any schemes of educational reform at all.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he did not think the hon. Baronet understood the point of his hon. friend who moved the Amendment. The greater the merits of the committee, the more likelihood that the County Councils would appoint such a committee, and he quite agreed that in the great majority of cases the local authorities would be desirous of having a special committee. But the Amendment did not exclude the appointment of a committee—only that they should have the power to appoint or not as they pleased. The Bill as amended laid it down that the County Councils "shall" appoint a committee or committees and that the County Councils shall refer certain matters for their consideration and report. Suppose a County Council disliked a committee, it might say if the appointment were made imperative, "Oh, we will appoint a dozen committees if you like." But when the committee reported a scheme to the County Council the report would be put into the waste-paper basket. There was no power in the Bill to compel the County Council to act on the committee's report. It was desirable therefore to put in the forefront of the Bill that the appointment of the committee should be optional. It was idle to disturb an unwilling County Council, and insist that they should appoint a committee, when that committee, once appointed, would have no power to see that their report was acted on. He agreed that the appointment of those committees would probably be very useful, but there were cases in small boroughs and urban districts—he knew of one—where it would be, to his mind, undesirable to act through a committee. Where there was a small centralised population, with a population of 10,000 or 20,000, if the Councils were obliged to appoint a committee, it would be very difficult to get a committee which would be as good as the Council itself. As to the statement of the hon. Member for Oldham, that the County Councils and the Borough Councils were already overburdened with work, well, in such a case the Councils would, as a matter of course, take advantage of the option in the Bill and appoint a committee. Therefore he would suggest that it would be wiser, when they were establishing a single educational authority, that as much responsibility and authority should be given them as possible, and not to limit them in the way proposed.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he was entirely in favour of the Amendment, because it would give greater elasticity to the working of the Bill. In no case would the County Council or Borough Council be shut out from the exercise of the power. The Secretary to the Board of Education had said that if the Amendment were carried the power would be taken away to appoint women on the committee. That did not follow at all from the Amendments, for women could be on a committee appointed by the County Council. When it came to small local authorities, like a borough of 10,000 inhabitants, it would be most convenient, in his opinion, that the Borough Council should act as the Education Committee. Under the scheme of the Bill the Borough Councils were bound to appoint a committee, all the members of which might not even be resident within the borough. He was entirely against the scheme of the Bill, and thought that the power of the educational authority should be absolutely unfettered. Under the Bill of 1896, one-third of the committee had to retire, but were eligible for re-election; and it could not be contended that that was not a proper provision. Under the present Bill, the scheme might be cut and dried, and there might be no provision for the retirement of any part of the committee; and therefore, however incompetent or inattentive the members may be, it would be impossible to supersede them. If, however, the Amendment were adopted, the local authority would be allowed to constitute itself a committee for the purposes of the Act, and would be persons who would, now and again, have to submit themselves for re-election. While he believed that it would be advisable in most cases, and he might say even in all cases, that committees should be appointed, he was strongly in favour of the Amendment, because it would give greater elasticity.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) said he should certainly vote against the Amendment. It had been made perfectly clear that the local authority would have supreme and absolute power, and that the committee would be of an advisory character, and in that capacity it would be of the greatest value. It had been pointed out that women could be members of the committee; and he thought it was also desirable that it should contain representatives of the teachers. The County Councils, in framing a scheme, would be very glad to have the opinions and representations of all the persons that would be affected. Further, the provisions empowering the County Council to put on the committee persons nominated by other bodies, was a very valuable one, as it would secure in the framing of the scheme the opinions of all classes in the area affected. He believed that the appointment of the committee would do much to produce a scheme of real force, and he would therefore oppose the Amendment.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that if he understood the Amendment as the hon. Member who had just spoken understood it, he should certainly vote against it. But it would not do away with the appointment of the committee at all. In ninety-nine cases out of every hundred committees would be appointed; but the Amendment would apply in a few cases of small boroughs with only 10,000 inhabitants or a little more, and of small urban districts with only 20,000 inhabitants, or a little more, where committees would be a great inconvenience. He thought the local authority should be given the power not to appoint a committee, but the Amendment would not prevent the appointment of a committee. In the great County Councils all the work was done through committees, and committees would be appointed; but in the smaller Councils it would be very difficult to find a useful and efficient committee. In such cases he thought that the County Councils ought to have the power of doing the work themselves, and should not be forced to appoint a committee, which necessarily must be rather inefficient in consequence of the fewness of the persons to choose from. The Amendment would not prevent the appointment of a committee in all places where a committee would be good and necessary; but in the few cases where a committee would be injurious, it would enable the local authority to act themselves. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

SIR WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said he would ask his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment, which he did not think could conduce in the least to the power or authority which the new local education authority ought to have in the small boroughs. He had the honour to represent a Lancashire constituency in which there were three small boroughs, two of which had School Boards. Speaking for those boroughs, he was quite sure the first thing they ought to do in relation to the new Act was to enforce on the local authority so constituted the obligation of at once forming executive committees. He thought it would be detrimental to the interests of education that the word "shall" should be taken out. Though he did not agree with the scheme of the Bill, he believed the first step towards replacing the School Boards now existing in the small towns ought to be made imperative upon the districts by Act of Parliament.

MR. CHANNING asked, if the Amendment were negatived and the word "shall" retained, would that prejudice the proviso suggested by the hon. Member for North West Ham, which he strongly supported?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that, subject to the ruling of the Chair, he thought that the retention of the word "shall" would not prejudice the proviso.

Question put.

The Committee proceeded to a Division, and the Chairman stated that he thought the Ayes had it; and, on his decision being challenged, it appeared to him that the Division was frivolously claimed, and he accordingly directed the Noes to stand up in their places, and three Members having stood up, the Chairman declared that the Ayes had it.

Names of the Minority taken down in the House:—

NOES.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire).
Strachey, Sir Edward.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

Amendment made—

"In page 4, line 27, by leaving out from the beginning to the word 'an' in line 29, and inserting the word 'establish.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) moved the omission of the words "or education committees." The object of the Bill was understood to be to set up in a given locality one and the same authority for elementary and secondary education, That was a vital part of the Bill, and he objected to words which would empower the local authority to set up two committees within its area, one for secondary and technical instruction, and the other for elementary education. It might be that that was not the intention of the framers of the Bill; but, as the Clause stood, it would empower, and to some extent invite, the local education authority to transact its business, not merely through one committee, but through two committees. It might be that the intention of the Government was that the local authority in the larger areas should have power to appoint committees on topographical grounds, not by reason of the different kind of education to be controlled. That might be proper and necessary; but the Clause should not be left in its present vague form. Over the whole of a county there should be one and the same committee for all kinds of schools. Although he did not think it was the intention of the Government, the words "education committees" would prevent that. It was necessary to know what was the intention of the Government, because a new feature was brought into the Bill which would be negative to the main features of the Bill, and which ran contrary to much of the argument by which the Bill had been supported, both in the Committee and in the country. The words "education committees" would divide the control of the work into two parts. It would assign to one committee elementary education, and practically set up another School Board and assign to another committee technical and higher education. Such a thing would in his opinion be foreign to the principles of the Bill, and for that reason he begged to move that the words "or education committees" be omitted. Already the principle of one and the same authority had been strained to a dangerous degree.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 29, to leave out the words 'or Education Committees,' and insert the words 'consisting as to a majority of Members of the Council, and as to the remainder.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or Education Committees' stand part of the Clause."

*(4.20.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it would be undesirable to fetter the local education authority in its arrangements as to the mode in which it should get educational advice within its area. There would be no obligation on the local authority to appoint more than one committee, but it might be desirable, and even necessary, in a large area to have more than one. The unity the hon. Member desired for all kinds of education would be found in the local authority itself. The hon. Gentleman would see that the mode in which it should collect advice must be left to that authority. So far as the hon. Member desired to prevent that advice being sectional, he would not secure it by his Amendment, because it would be impossible to prevent a committee appointing sub-committees. He could not accept the Amendment.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE admitted there was a good deal to be said on both sides. He had been much struck by the manner in which, in the county with which he was connected, the landowners and farmers had become interested in technical education and had taken a real interest in such technical education as agricultural education. It might be that under the conditions of this Clause, although they might be disposed to accept the general policy of the committee, it would be found almost impossible to induce them to continue the very useful and increasingly useful work which they were beginning to look upon as their own, and to take considerable pride in. At the same time he felt that his hon. friend had been fully justified in raising this question, but he thought that he would be wise to withdraw his Amendment, because although it might work out very well in some ways it would do a great deal of harm in others. He assumed, of course, that these words had nothing to do with sub-Section 3, because these committees were matters upon which he looked with some suspicion. It was one thing to appoint a committee for technical education, and another for elementary education, but quite another thing to cut up the county into two or three large areas, each under a separate committee. Sub-Section 3 dealt with the geographical areas, but the subject with which the Committee was dealing now was whether the people could divide education into three large classes.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) supported the withdrawal of the Amendment. As he understood, it would be open to the local education authority to appoint one committee for secondary education and one for elementary education. That would be a very important point for the Welsh Members to consider when they came to deal with sub-Section 6.

MR. YOXALL expressed his dissatisfaction with the statement made by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board of Education. He again pointed out that this was a matter which must be considered seriously. It now became evident for the first time in all these debates that the Government contemplated permission being given to the local education authorities under the Bill to retain and maintain the existing division between elementary and technical schools which had worked so badly in the past. In the past a School Board existed, with powers over public elementary education, and in the same borough a Technical Education Committee existed with certain powers for the purposes of technical instruction. There was no co-ordination between those two authorities. The hon. Gentleman said that co-ordination would exist in the Council itself, but it could only be assumed that the Council would adopt the reports of its committees *pro formâ*, as it did at present the reports of its committees for routine work. Therefore the same conditions would exist as at present. One committee would deal with technical instruction in an entirely different manner to another, and the curriculum of the elementary school would bear no relation to the curriculum of the technical school or the secondary school. There would be no common knowledge on the part af one committee of the needs of the various kinds of schools dealt with by the other committee, and they would simply perpetuate the existing bad educational conditions, which could not be justified on any educational basis that he was aware of. The Council was to be the local authority, and in the last resort would rule. It was now proposed to devolve upon a separate committee the task of governing certain schools. If the Government consented to do that he would begin to tax them with insincerity in regard to the alleged aim of the Bill, which, for all the good it would then do, might as well never have been introduced. The words "or educational committees" meant that the local authority would be able, and almost invited, to set up separate committees for elementary, technical and secondary schools. That would not relieve the local authority of work, but it would almost inevitably lead to friction between the different committees. He urged the Prime Minister in the interests of the children and in the the interest of education not to allow these words to remain in their unqualified form. He was perfectly willing to withdraw the Amendment and move the insertion of "sub," so that the Clause would read "education committee or education subcommittees" if the right hon. Gentleman would accept the latter Amendment.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE pointed out that the Amendment of the hon. Member would place several Members in a difficult position, because, although they agreed with much he had said, they would be obliged to vote against the proposal inasmuch as the words of the Clause gave an important security, topographically considered, to certain portions of certain districts. He suggested, however, that the hon. Member might carry out his purpose by a proviso at the end of the Clause that the plural committees should apply only topographically, and not as far as classes of schools were concerned. There had been a virtual promise that for certain portions of large counties there should be separate committees, and that promise would fail of fulfilment if either proposal of the hon. Member were accepted.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) thought the discussion had revealed the great difficulty there would be in applying this Bill in the rural districts. In towns there would be no difficulty in having one autonomous and single committee for the whole area, but in sparsely populated counties of large area it would be impossible to work the elementary schools without some subordinate local authority to look after the details. It might be said that the managers would do that. But in the denominational schools the managers could not be so fully trusted as in the provided schools, and in order to secure satisfactory administration there would have to be subordinate committees over areas of a limited extent to superintend the schools in those areas. That would aid in the co-ordination which all were anxious to secure between elementary and secondary education, and would relieve the central body of a vast amount of work which otherwise they could not possibly carry out. He suggested that the Government should make some alteration of the phraseology enabling the local education authority to work, not only through its committee, but either by appointing subordinate committees, or in some other way to provide for the necessary decentralisation of the work of elementary schools.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY agreed that in some counties it would be most desirous to have two committees both dealing with the higher work, each taking one portion of the county, and both reporting to the County Council. It was scarcely necessary, however, to say a single word as to the obvious danger of allowing, or almost inviting, a County Borough Council to appoint two committees, one dealing with elementary and the other with higher education. It should be remembered that there would be a tendency in that direction from the fact that the two forms of education had been separate in the past, and that regrettable divorce between elementary and higher education would be perpetuated. He would prefer sub-committees to separate committees, because the former would have to report to the one advising body before the matter reached the Council. Everyone knew what happened to such reports when they went before the County Councils. Unless there was some notorious new departure the Council would not trouble itself in the matter, but as soon as it had confidence in its committee, would accept its reports without discussion or comment. Would it not be possible for the representative of the

Board of Education to give an undertaking that no scheme would be approved which perpetuated this separation between higher and elementary education. The Board of Education were anxious to secure co-ordination; it was the desire of the Government. Then let them not nullify their own proposals by leaving it open to the Borough Councils to adopt machinery which would make it impossible for those proposals to be carried out. If such an assurance as he had suggested were given he would be prepared to let the Clause pass, but he would much prefer to have the words in the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said this point seemed to be outside the region of controversy, for they were all agreed as to the object to be attained. He thought, however, that these things ought to be provided for in the Bill, and the point was not too insignificant to put in express terms in the Bill itself. To him the answer given to the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan, that it was possible to set up two separate committees, was quite alarming. He hardly thought that that was contemplated by the Prime Minister or the Secretary to the Board of Education. The success of the American system of education was due largely to the fact that there was this co-ordination. Surely they ought not to start now contemplating the possibility of severing the functions of the committee, one committee to run primary, and the other secondary education. This had led to no end of difficulties in the past, and he always understood that it was those difficulties which had given rise to this Bill. Instead of the quarrels between School Boards and Town Councils this proposal would in the future give rise to quarrels between two committees, and they would not improve matters by simply changing the combatants. Education would suffer by those quarrels, and so they ought to make it clear that there should be only one authority with indisputable claims to manage both secondary and primary education. A good deal had been said about sub-committees, but he did not think it was necessary to give this power in the Bill, because every committee had power to appoint sub-committees. Any body could appoint a committee of two or three to attend to one special branch of a subject, and there ought to be no difficulty about that. Why should they add to the possibility of difficulties and quarrels by saying that provided schools should be under the control of one committee up to four o'clock, and after that time under the control of another committee? Between ten in the morning and four in the afternoon one authority controlled, and between four and ten the following morning there would be another authority. That was so absurd and ridiculous that surely a few words inserted in the Bill would simplify matters.

(4.50.) MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) thought it would be wise to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend. He had had some experience in these matters, and he thought it was very advisable that one committee should deal with all forms of education. He did not say that no sub-committees should be appointed, because the area must be divided into sub-committees, but it was eminently desirable that all the recommendations of these sub-committees should come before the committee itself. The executive education committee should have before it all the recommendations of the sub-committees, and unless they had something of that kind he agreed with the hon. Member for North West Ham that some of the promises which had been held out with regard to this Bill ran some risk of not being realised. They ought to do everything they could to prevent any possibility of that kind taking place. He hoped the suggestions which had found favour with a good many hon. Members on both sides as to the importance of giving power to separate very large areas into separate districts would be met. By adopting this course they would be doing more in the interests of education generally than if they adopted the proposal as it was in the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not heard the whole of the debate upon this point, but I have heard enough to appreciate the general tenor of the views on both sides of the House. Hon. Members fear that if more than one committee is permitted the division of the duties between two or more committees will be, as it were, a horizontal division dividing secondary and primary education, and not a perpendicular division. With that general declaration of policy the Government are in entire harmony. We have from the beginning, and from the day I introduced the Bill, contended that it would be a great misfortune if the prophecies of my hon. friend the Member for North West Ham came true, and if education was not now co-ordinated, but divided between School Boards and Technical Instruction Committees, thus perpetuating them under new names under this Bill. But while I sympathise with that general view of policy, I am very reluctant to limit the discretion of the education authority unduly. We must be careful what we do in this matter, and not tie their hands too closely in matters which concern their proper function of dealing with secondary education. I have been trying in a rough way to draft words which I think would carry out the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite. I do not think they will come in here, and it is very likely that they will require some modification at the hands of the Attorney General. My idea was to introduce later on in the Clause words something like these—"If the scheme provides more than one committee, regard shall be had under the scheme to the need for co-ordinating the different kinds of education." That, I think, would not lay down a hard and fast rule, but it would be an indication to the local authorities that the Education Department in approving the scheme must not lose sight of the primary object of the scheme, namely to co-ordinate all kinds of education. If an Amendment of that kind lower down in the Clause will meet the views of hon. Gentlemen, I shall be prepared to consider the exact form it shall take.

Mr. M'KENNA pointed out that by a sub-Clause it was already provided that more than one committee might be appointed on topographical grounds. In the absence of any explanation from the Government, they were bound to assume that the functions of these rival committees would be to deal with separate branches of education in the same area. If two committees were appointed in this way, there would be three bodies, all within the same area, dealing with education, and they would lose the last hope of co-ordinating all branches of education under one authority. He did not think the amending words of the First Lord o the Treasury would carry out the object of his hon. friend.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE said he regretted to differ from his hon. friend. It was perfectly true that it would be disastrous, from the point of view of all, to separate primary and secondary education, but he reminded the Committee that there were classes of education under the head of technical instruction which were quite away and distinct from anything which was ordinarily called primary or secondary education, though no doubt they came within one or the other. In his county they had appointed an agricultural committee, which dealt with that portion of technical education which was of importance to those engaged in farming. While a committee of that kind did valuable work in connection with a particular industry, he thought it would be disastrous to separate primary and secondary education in the ordinary acceptation of the words.

Sir WILLIAM MATHER said it was of great importance to have continuity and co-ordination through the whole area.

Mr. ALEXANDER BROWN (Shropshire, Wellington) said he agreed generally with what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman opposite.

*Mr. YOXALL asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he would agree to insert the word "district" before the words "Education Committee."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not think he could do that without running counter to the argument of the noble Lord the Member for the Cricklade Division.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said it seemed to him that there was no difficulty whatever in maintaining the authority of the local education authority, and at the same time, if found necessary, delegating their powers to the different localities.

MR. M'KENNA said there was a way in which all parties could come together and be at one in this matter, and that was a very desirable thing. His own objection to the proposal of the Prime Minister was that there were to be separate committees. Was it not better to say to the local authority that one comprehensive committee ought to be enough, and that there should be one committee, with such sub-committees as might be appointed, to deal with the whole system of education? The experts who were skilled in different branches of education could be put upon the sub-committees.

*MR. YOXALL said that having regard to what had fallen from the Prime Minister, although friction might result between the local education authority and the Board of Education if his proposal were adopted, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthen, W.) to move an Amendment standing in his name.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) asked whether the following Amendment standing in his name before that of the hon. Member for West Carmarthen was out of order—

> "In page 4, line 29, after the second word 'education,' to leave out to end of Clause, and insert the words 'consisting of members of the Council, who shall have power to co-opt other persons to serve on such education committee, but the total number of such co-opted members shall be less than half the total number of members of such committee.'"

* THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment does not read.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said that owing to a clerical error the word "education" was inserted instead of the word "committee."

* THE CHAIRMAN: It ought to come as an Amendment to sub-Clause (*a*). What the hon. Member wants, so far as I can gather, is that a majority of the committee shall be members of the Council.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said his first object was to get rid of the scheme, because he believed the County Councils were perfectly competent to manage their own educational work.

* THE CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. Lloyd Morgan to move the Amendment standing in his name, when,

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, on a point of order, said he thought that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Saffron Walden should come first.

* THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that if the Amendment of the hon. Member for Saffron Walden were put and negatived, that would cut out the other Amendments on the same point. Hon. Members could take it as they pleased.

(5.18.). MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.) said that the object of his Amendment was to secure that the appointment of the Committee should be for a term of three years, and three years only. He presumed that under the Clause as it stood the committee or committees would become permanent bodies, and that seemed to him to be a most objectionable course. If the committee or committees were really to be representative of the County Councils and the Borough Councils, then it was absolutely necessary that there should be some limit of time for them holding office. They ought not to exist as a committee for a longer period than three years. The Government Bill of 1896 provided that the educational committee was to exist for three years, and three years only, and that one-third of the committee should retire every three years. That was a system which ought to be adopted in the present Bill. The County Council in electing the committee under the Act might be under the impression that certain persons who had had no previous experience in educational matters had a right to be elected, but the process of time might prove to them that they had made a mistake and that the members so elected by them were not the best men for educational work. It seemed to him that an unreasonable fetter was placed on the County Council if it were said that they had no power to release these members of the Committee from service upon it, even if they had changed their opinions. He knew of no committee of the County Council at present which became a permanent body, except the county governing body constituted under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, and, although he had no other authority for saying so, he thought that was a mistake. In the case of the Standing Joint Committee of the County Council the members were only appointed for a limited time. The County Councils constantly changed the members of the Standing Joint Committee when it was found that they were not carrying out the views of the County Council. That principle ought to be applied to the educational affairs of the county, and if the members of the Education Committee who had been elected to carry out the provisions of the Act failed in the discharge of their duty or to satisfy the County Council, they ought to give the County Council power to decide that those members should not hold office for more than three years.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, after the word 'committee,' to insert the words 'appointed for a term of three years and.'" (*Mr. Lloyd Morgan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

* SIR WILLIAM ANSON said nobody had ever dreamt that these committees should be permanent bodies, and there was nothing in the Bill to suggest that that had ever been contemplated from the beginning of the scheme. As a matter of fact, the hon. Gentleman proposed by his Amendment to give a much greater security for the permanence of the committees than the Bill ever contemplated. If a majority of the committee were members of the County Council, and ceased to be members of the Council or to be qualified as councillors, they could not continue to be members of the committee. What the Government really desired was that the tenure of office of the members of the committee should be precisely what the local education authority should give it, whether long or short. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that there was nothing in the Bill to suggest that these committees were to be of a permanent character, and that the hon. Member proposed by his Amendment to give them a greater security of tenure than was specified or contemplated in the Bill. Their tenure of office, whatever it might be, would have to be determined by the schemes to be framed by the Councils, and approved of by the Board of Education.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire W.R., Pudsey) thought that the speech of the hon. Baronet had afforded more reason for supporting the Amendment than the remarks of the hon. Member who had moved it. Unless the words of the Amendment were adopted the constitution of the committee might be entirely out of harmony with that of the County Council or the Borough Council. What was going to be done in the case of the members elected to represent the County Council on these committees if the County Council came to an end before the term of office of the education committee expired? The members of the education committee would be hung up between wind and water—appointed to represent the County Council, and yet not representing the County Council, for some County Councils might have appointed the members of the education committee for terms of four, five, or even six years. He thought common-sense should guide the Committee to the acceptance of the Amendment. They should adopt the practice which was in vogue in County Councils and Municipal Corporations, and fix the term for which the members of the committee were appointed, and make the term so short that they should represent the County Council or the Borough Council, otherwise the education committee might be entirely out of touch with the body which appointed them.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would remind the hon. Member that if a member of the education committee was placed on the committee as a member of the Council he would cease to be a member of the committee if he ceased to be a member of the Council. He thought the objection of the hon. Member was not a real one.

*MR. CHANNING thought that the words which had fallen from the Secretary to the Board of Education really aggravated the case. The real point was that the Secretary to the Education Department had now told the Committee that the term of office of the members of the education committee was to be determined in the scheme made by the Council, and approved by the Board of Education. But it was possible that a Council might draw up a scheme, and obtain the consent of the Board of Education to it, which would saddle the education committee with a body of outsiders, which might be a permanent body, and would obtain thereby the control of all the machinery of education in the county or borough, and which might be out of touch with the opinions and sentiments of the people who elected the County Council or the Borough Council. It seemed to him that if there were no fixed term of office, and that while elected members of the Council could sit only for a time, outsiders nominated on the Committee might have an unlimited tenure of office, it could only lead to their having education handed over to an irresponsible group of outsiders who would obtain absolute and permanent control of all branches of education in the district. That would be a very serious state of things. Practically the whole education of the country would pass into the hands of an irresponsible and permanent body wholly out of touch, it might be, with the people concerned.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he thought that this was one of those minutiæ which it would be wiser to leave to the decision of the County and Borough Councils themselves. Some of these schemes, he thought, were not very well suited to the more general terms adopted in legislation.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked the Secretary to the Board of Education whether they could understand that during his tenure of office, at any rate, the schemes of the various education authorities would only be approved by the Department if the members of the County Council elected to the education committee were to remain members of that committee merely during their term of office on the Council. Although he disliked the Clause he would be satisfied if the Government on this Amendment would give an assurance that that would be the policy of the Education Department with regard to these schemes.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said if the number of the members of the County Council on the committee fell short of a majority the intention was that the County Council should elect others.

MR. BRYCE said he did not understand that the majority of the committee was to consist of members of the County Council.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said there might be a majority unless the County Council determined that there should not be.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said the position was obvious. These committees would perform a very onerous duty, and it might well be that many of the County Councils would not desire to undertake it. He thought it was extremely unlikely that there would be a majority of members of the County Councils on these bodies; they would desire these onerous duties to be performed by somebody else.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS pointed out that it did not follow from the words in this Section that the position occupied by a member of the County Council on the committee would cease to be occupied by him when he ceased to be a member of the County Council. The question he put, to which he had not yet got an answer, was whether the Education Department would see to it that members of the committee should only be members of that committee for such time as they were members of the County Council.

MR. BRIGG expressed the opinion that with regard to the co-option of members, unless some definite time were put down for their co-option, they would remain in office after they ceased to be members of County Councils. The other members, he took it, would go out of office when they lost their position on the County Councils, but the co-opted members would remain.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he had some hesitation in pronouncing an opinion on the interpretation of the Bill which might bind the Education Department upon questions which had not yet been brought before it, but he might say that, if a certain majority of members of the committee were to be members of the County Council, and the qualification of their membership of the committee was that they should also be members of the County Council, they would cease to be members of the committee on losing that qualification. The duration of the term of office for the co-opted members of the committee would have to be provided for in the scheme. It would be the business of the local authority to provide for that. If they did not do so, it would be considered an accidental omission on their part, and the Education Board would call their attention to the matter.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) asked to have it made perfectly clear by some words in the Bill that if a member of the committee lost his qualification as a member of the County Council he should also lose his position on the committee. He pointed out that a great many members of a committee who were also members of the County Council might be elected to the County Council on other issues altogether, for the purpose of continuing them on the committee on account of their having done good service. What hon. Members on this side wanted was quite clear, but what they wished to hear from the hon. Baronet opposite was whether their wishes would be carried out by the insertion of words into the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought it was important to know whether there was going to be a term to the membership of members of the committee who were not also members of the County Council. The members appointed by the County Council would be representatives of the rateyayers, but the co-opted members would be experts, and the conduct of those gentlemen might not always commend itself to the County Council or the general body of the district. They could not always anticipate how men would work. Because they took an interest in education, they need not necessarily be good administrators. Therefore he wished to know whether it was clear that there was a term for the membership of these gentlemen.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he thought he had clearly stated that the Government never contemplated that these co-opted or added members of the committee should have any condition of permanency attached to their appointment. The local authorities, he presumed, would fix the term of the appointment, which it might be desirable to make longer or shorter in some cases than in others, according to the varying conditions of the different local bodies. But if the local authority omitted to fix any term, he would consider that that was an accidental omission, and it would be the duty of the Board of Education to call attention to it.

MR. BRYCE said he understood his hon. friend's idea to be that these schemes should provide for a short term. Personally, he would prefer three years. Would the hon. Gentleman say that the term should be three years?

MR. WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) remarked that every County Council Committee was re-appointed every year, and unless this Education Committee was to be in a different position from the other committees of the Council no difficulty would arise in this respect. There need be no term of three years, or term of two years; let it be like the other committees.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) endorsed the statement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and deprecated putting every minute detail into the Bill. Under the existing law, the Technical Instruction Act, it was provided that the County Councils could co-opt their committee members from outside the County Council, and the election of all committees was settled by the Standing Orders of the County Council. If every minute detail was put into the Bill, there would be nothing for bye-laws or Standing Orders to settle.

MR. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthenshire, E.) said that probably an annual election would be the best thing in this matter, but if any other time were to be selected it should not exceed three years. He therefore proposed that the Amendment should be amended by changing the phrase "appointed for a term of three years" to "appointed for a term not exceeding three years."

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN accepted this Amendment to his Amendment.

Amendment amended—

"By leaving out the word 'of,' and inserting the words 'not exceeding.'"—(*Mr. Abel Thomas.*)

(5.48.) Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 118; Noes, 241. (Division List, No. 477.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg. John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans. Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brymnor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan. John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J. A. (Glam'rg'n, Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Lloyd Morgan and
Mr. Abel Thomas.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow)
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile

Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hon Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hon Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshier)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n-und. Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

(6.5.) DR. MACNAMARA, in moving the insertion after “Committees” of the words “which shall in all cases be subject to the decisions of the local education authority, and shall be,” said he recognised that the position had been sensibly changed since the modified constitution of the local education authority had been placed before the Committee. He was in some doubt as to the precise functions of the local authority, because, when the matter was discussed in June last, there were many references to the committee being constituted in the same manner as a Watch Committee, which was not required to report its proceedings to the parent Council, and was not in any way subject to its decisions. He would formally move the Amendment, in order to elicit whether the committee would be subject in all respects to the local authority.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 30, after the word 'committees,' to insert the words 'which shall in all cases be subject to the decisions of the local education authority, and shall be.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the point to which the hon. Member desired to call attention would much more directly arise on the Amendment standing in the name of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education. He thought that when that Amendment was reached the hon. Member would see that all that he desired was effectively carried out, and perhaps with that statement he would be satisfied to allow the matter to remain until his hon. friend's Amendment was reached.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE, in moving the omission of the remainder of the Clause after the words "or education committees," said his object was to do away with the necessity of appealing to the Board of Education with schemes altogether. Everybody acquainted with the working of committees of municipal corporations or county councils knew that those committees were quite capable of drawing up any scheme which they thought necessary for their own work. At present the Technical Education Committees formed their own schemes, and were not subject to the control of the education authority. He believed the same confidence might be reposed in the bodies now to be created. It was absurd to think that they should be kept in leading strings by the Board of Education. If, however, these bodies were given the privilege of carrying out their own schemes he thought it should be provided that the committees should be annually elected, with power to co-opt a minority, while a majority of the members should be direct representatives of the local education authority. By that means a great deal of cumbrous and unnecessary work in connection with the submission of schemes to the Board of Education would be obviated. He suggested two grounds on which the Government might well accept the Amendment—first, that these bodies were capable of carrying out their work and ought to be entrusted with these powers, and secondly, that the Clause would then be disposed of and the remainder of the Bill could be proceeded with.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, to leave out from the word 'committees,' to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. Joseph A. Pease.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'constituted in accordance with a scheme made by the Council' stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY assured the hon. Member that it was from no want of confidence in the local education authority that he asked the Committee not to accept this Amendment. The Bill, as it stood, did not provide for elasticity as regarded the frame-work of the schemes, and every regard would be had to local wants and exigencies in determining what the schemes should be. ["By whom?"] By the Board of Education as well as by the local education authority. Doubtless the hon. Member would agree as to the desirability of a certain amount of co-ordination, and the Board of Education was that which, after all, must remain the central authority to see that there is no more divergence in the schemes than local circumstances required. It was left entirely with the local authority to frame its scheme, and there was no regulation whatever with a view to bringing the various schemes into relation with one another. There was no desire to tryannise over the local authorities, but surely it was desirable that the experience possessed by the central authority as to what had been found to work well in one locality should be at the service of another locality. He therefore submitted that it was much better that the schemes should be prepared by the local authorities, subject to the supervision of the Board of Education, in the manner proposed in the Bill.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said that the element of schemes was one of the most objectionable in the Bill. There could not be found in any other portion of our local government a parallel to the present proposal. To say, in reference to money coming from the public exchequer and the local rates, that the money should be dealt with by a body composed under a scheme approved by the Board of Education, was not only a novel proposal, but a very serious innovation in the practice of the country in regard to local government and the administration of public money. No information had yet been given as to how the Board of Education intended these schemes to be worked. He presumed the nomination of the minority on these committees will lie with other bodies. First of all, the County Council would suggest the bodies that should have power to nominate representatives. It seemed to him that that was a means of enabling denominational and other schools to secure an indirect interest in the authority that would administer this money. He quite agreed that if there were a university college in the area it should have its representative on the local education authority, but that was not all that this proposal would do. It would secure that a great variety of interests should be represented. Besides the denominational schools, there would be secondary schools, grammar schools, technical schools, and any other kind of endowed school that happened to exist within the area, all wanting to nominate representatives. They would obviously go to push the interests of their own school. He had no doubt that that would be the result of the working of the scheme. To whom would those people owe their allegiance? Not to the public interest, not to the County Council, but to the different bodies and schools and boards in the area, and they would all push those particular interests. If they did not they would not be considered to have done their duty, and they would not find a place on those committees for a second time. If they were going to have co-option, then the authority should be the co-opting authority. They should be able to call in those who had had experience in university, technical, and secondary education, but that they should have the right of putting on their own nominees was an infringement upon public responsibility and public administration. If they had a scheme of this kind they left people open to intrigue. In fixing this scheme they would have hundreds of applications setting forth their right to be represented, and the President of the Board of Education would have to adjudicate upon them, and he did not think the Education Department should have that duty to discharge. Why should the Department be called upon to say that this school had a right to one, this to two, and another to no representatives at all? It would be impossible for the Department to adjudicate between all these interests. But while all these sectarian bodies would have this right there would be one body that would have no right at all, and that body would be those who had had experience on School Boards and who thoroughly understood School Board work. He remembered the hon. Gentleman opposite saying that under this Bill School Boards would continue to exist except in their corporate and financial capacity. He could not imagine a body existing that had lost those capacities. It seemed to him that this was a proposal which would open the door to a tremendous amount of back-door influence and intriguing of all kinds. It was a proposal which would do a great deal to withdraw that confidence in public administration which would be given if County Councils were left to do their work on their own responsibility. He should support the Amendment.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE thought the hon. Member opposite had raised a good many points which did not arise on this Amendment. He did not think that some of his arguments were well-founded, because, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, there had existed for a good many years a very strong analogy to the bodies proposed to be set up under this Bill. Those bodies were doing excellent work, and they were constituted by the initiative of the County Councils, confirmed by a Government Department. The County Councils would have full power of initiative, and they did not anticipate any of the dangers which were foreshadowed by hon. Gentlemen opposite.

MR. BRYCE said that he would leave it to his hon. friends from Wales to deal with the Welsh case. He would point out, however, that this Amendment raised a very much larger principle which could not be dealt with by any reference to a special case of that kind. The weak point of the Bill was that the Government had determined to throw a great mass of new and very difficult work upon bodies which were already heavily loaded, and which had not been elected with any view to their educational capacity. They had contended from the first discussion on this Bill that the capital error of the Bill was that it destroyed Boards which had been specially chosen, and which had acquired special knowledge, and they were substituting for them a new authority which was already fully occupied with other work, and which had no special competence for the new work. The Government, like the sensible men that they were, felt the weakness of their own scheme. Of course they did not admit it, and nobody expected that they would, but they felt it all the same, and they had determined to try to get rid of this weakness. The Government's device for getting rid of the difficulty thus created was to shift all the work, except the ultimate control, from the local authority to the committee, and then to constitute the committee by putting experts upon it. Then, in order to make certain that there should be experts, they appointed experts by means of this scheme. That was not the course that any people who had not set out with a determination to extinguish the School Boards would have adopted. The Government had inevitably been driven to adopt the scheme which they had proposed. Nevertheless it did not make a good plan, although it might be the best way out of the difficulties which the Government had imposed upon themselves. Let them face the matter upon its merits. He thought they might consider the merits of the proposal quite apart from any predilection of a scheme because it came from the Government. He admitted that it was desirable to have an expert element. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] He really did not understand that laughter, coming as it did from hon. Members who never contributed anything to their debates. The expert element was a necessary element, and they all agreed that if they could secure experts it would be a good thing to do. So far he was at one with the Government, but he believed that if they left the matter to the County and Borough Councils they would put on experts. His own knowledge of County and Borough Councils led him to feel perfectly certain that they would avail themselves of this expert knowledge, and endeavour to qualify themselves for the work they had to discharge by obtaining the most capable men. The Government thought that this must be secured by providing by their scheme that experts must be put on. But they went further because evidently they intended not merely that the Council should have power to choose its own experts, but also that nominations might be made by other persons who were to be forced upon the local education authority. That was going a very long way. His first objection to this course was that it was not at all respectful to the local authorities themselves. They purported to give these powers to the local authorities, and then they forced upon them persons who were not of their own choice. But there was a more grievous objection. How could they tell who were the persons whom the scheme would require to be appointed upon these committees? Upon this subject the Government had preserved from the first an ominous silence, and had not given any indication as to who the persons were who would be nominated. They saw in the Bill that experts were to be appointed by other bodies, and they had asked who the other bodies were, but no information had been given. They had, from other sources, reason to conjecture that these other bodies would in some cases be bodies representing sectional interests, not primarily educational. But if they agreed to the scheme they would agree to it in the form in which the Government put it forth, which was to give to these extraneous bodies, of whom the Committee knew nothing, the right to select members of these committees. If the scheme were to be made by the County Council or the Borough Council he should not be very much afraid. They were, after all, popular bodies responsible to the electorate, and he was persuaded that they would not put on any nominated body any person with whom this House would be displeased. But where did the ultimate voice lie? It lay with the

Board of Education. If a scheme proposed by a County Council did not meet with the approval of the Board of Education, that Board was to make a scheme itself.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: By Provisional Order.

MR. BRYCE said the Board of Education would still have the last voice. They all knew what happened under a Provisional Order. They all knew that there was another House which had as much voice as the House of Commons in a Provisional Order. They could not look on the provision that the scheme should be framed by Provisional Order as at all adequate. In this matter the last voice ought not to lie, as it would lie under the Provisional Order plan, with the Board of Education. The price the Government asked them to pay for having experts on these bodies was too high. If the Government would say what bodies were likely to have the nominations that might remove some of the distrust with which the proposal was now surrounded, but if the scheme was to be placed before them as it stood at present, he thought they must reject it altogether. They must say that Parliament should fix the composition of the committees, and if Parliament did not do so it should be left to the local authority, but they could not leave the matter to be dealt with by the Board of Education by Provisional Order, and then to be pushed through the House as a Party measure under circumstances that would give no opportunity for adequate discussion.

(6.33.) SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said the account which the right hon. Gentleman had given of the genesis of this particular provision was quite inaccurate. The right hon. Gentleman had reiterated the old fallacy which seemed especially dear to the other side of the House—that in School Board elections the electors rushed to the poll to choose the representatives most educationally fit. The real genesis of the present difficulty was that the Technical Instruction Committees of the County and Borough Councils had been doing excellent work for the last twelve years. The Technical Instruction Committee of the London County Council had done invaluable service, and it was constituted exactly according to the scheme of this Clause. The majority of its members were members of the Council, and there were also representatives of all kinds of educational interests. [AN HON. MEMBER: Appointed by outside bodies?] Some of them were appointed by outside bodies, among which was the London Trades Council. Though he was strongly of the opinion that the County and Borough Councils might be trusted gradually to arrive at a satisfactory composition of their Education Committees, yet the time of the House was not wasted in trying to give certain indications to the Councils as to what the committees should consist of. He would give an example which would, he thought, appeal strongly to the personal feelings of his right hon. friend. One of the great misfortunes in the composition of these Technical Instruction Committees was that so very few of them included women. The members of County Councils were exclusively males, and with regard to the Technical Instruction Commitees, with few exceptions they had entirely ignored the desirability of having women upon them. The advice of the Board of Education might serve to ensure the inclusion of women in the Education Committees. The whole composition of the scheme would be left to the local authority. It was a great mistake for the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Board of Education could make a scheme and force it upon a local authority. He seemed to belittle the influence of this House in the matter of Provisional Orders. These generally passed because they were wholly unopposed, but if an attempt were made to foist on a great town like Liverpool or Manchester a scheme to which the Council objected, he was certain that it would be opposed; and, if opposed, the matter would not be settled, as the right hon. Gentleman suggested, by a Party majority. It would be settled by a Private Bill Committee, who would decide, not on Party grounds, but in such a manner as would, in their judgment, secure the justice of the case. He would pity his hon. friend, the Secretary to the Board of Education, if he should at any time have the misfortune to defend in this House a scheme in a Provisional Order which had been proposed by the Board of Education, and objected to by one of the municipal boroughs or a great County Council. He did not think the Bill would have much chance of going through the House if opposed. If there was anything in the scheme to which just objection could be taken, he should think it highly probable that a Committee of this House would reject the Provisional Order. He thought there were certain provisions which might be included in this Clause which would not cripple and impede the Councils, but would give them advice and suggestion of an extremely valuable character, and assist them in the making of a scheme. He hoped that when a scheme had been framed it would never be interfered with except in the most extreme cases.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that the whole argument of the right hon. Gentleman was addressed to the action of the County Councils in the matter of technical education. What had been their action? It had been satisfactory because it had been done on their own responsibility. If these local authorities were good for anything, they ought to have the power of making their own schemes. Why should those bodies, because they had discharged so well and so satisfactorily the business for which they had been chosen, the moment they embarked on a new business be put under the tutelage of another authority? A more irrational argument than that of the right hon. Gentleman it was impossible to conceive. The hon. Gentleman had spoken as if this were a suggestion of the Education Department. Suggestion! Why, the Education Department had an absolute veto on the scheme of the education authority. What was obvious was that the Government did not really trust the local authorities. That appeared in every Clause of the Bill. In Clause 8, sub-Section 2, local authorities were put under the control of the Education Department, because they did not trust them. Having allowed the local authorities to appoint their own Technical Instruction Committee, the Government now made any scheme of general education which the local authorities might propose subject to the consent of the Education Board. The Bill said: "The Education Committee constituted in accordance with a scheme made by the Council and approved by the Board of Education." Well, if the Board of Education did not approve there was no scheme; there was an end to it. Then sub-Section 4 went on: "Before approving a scheme the Board of Education shall take such measures as may seem expedient for the purpose of giving publicity to the provisions of the proposed scheme, and may, if they think fit, hold a public inquiry." What position did that put the education authority in? And the hon. Gentleman claimed that that was only the Education Department making a suggestion! The public inquiry was, of course, to prove that the scheme of the education authority was a bad one. It was obvious that the whole of this was founded on absolute distrust of the local authorities. Why should not the Government leave the local authorities to act as they now did through their Technical Instruction Committees. If the Education Department disapproved of the schemes of the Borough Councils or County Councils, it was because they thought these bodies were unfit to do their duty, and that a public inquiry should be held to support their views in condemning the schemes. That was what the hon Gentleman called a "suggestion." He should have used another word for it than "suggestion" Then, "If a scheme under this section has not been made by a Council, and approved by the Board of Education within twelve months after the passing of the Act, the Board may, subject to the provisions of this Act, make a Provisional Order for the purposes for which a scheme might have been made." Well, the Education Department represented the Government of the day, and when they introduced a Provisional Order the Government would put it as a political question, and very likely a religious question, and pass it by means of their majority. Then, of course, they could carry out that Provisional Order by *mandamus*. A *mandamus* was a "suggestion" to the County Councils or the Borough Councils! He maintained that the provisions of the Clause were insulting to large local bodies. Why did not the Government trust them in this as in other matters?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the right hon. Gentleman harped too much on the single string of Government distrust of the local authorities. There was no such distrust. He thought that the arguments the right hon. Gentleman used in connection with this subject were a good deal exaggerated. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to attribute to the local authorities a sort of infallibility, and had spoken with great feeling that it was an insult to hold an inquiry as to whether a scheme was a good one or not. He ventured to say that there was not a local authority in the country which would not repudiate such extravagant language put forth by the right hon. Gentleman. The local authorities had the good sense to know that, after all, they were mortal, and he was quite sure that, so far from regarding a public inquiry, where they would have an opportunity of bringing forward their views, as an insult they would welcome it. The right hon. Gentleman spoke as if the section provided that the public inquiry was to be held after the decision of the Board of Education. It was nothing of the kind. The provision of the section was—

> "Before approving of a scheme, the Board of Education shall take such measures as may appear expedient for the purpose of giving publicity to the provisions of the proposed scheme, and may, if they think fit, hold a public inquiry."

Inquiry was not to follow, but to precede, their decision. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the Board of Education could carry any Provisional Order that they chose to arrive at with almost certainty. He ventured to take issue with the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman knew that with reference to any Provisional Order a petition might be presented, that petition would go before a Committee of this House, and there would be a judicial inquiry.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: And a very costly one.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: What the right hon. Gentleman said was that the Provisional Order would be carried as of course; but the Order would be sent to a Committee, and if that Committee arrived at the conclusion that the preamble had not been proved, he ventured to say that no Government would, except in the most exceptional and special circumstances, venture to over-ride the Report of the Committee. The procedure was hedged round by the highest safeguards, and to suggest that these Provisional Orders would be run through the House without regard to the justice of the matter was a mere delusion. On the whole, he submitted to the Committee that there must be some provision for an inquiry to correct any mistakes. If the public inquiry revealed defects in the scheme, there was nothing to prevent the local authority sending up another scheme which would embody the improvements necessary to correct the weak points disclosed by the inquiry. Under these circumstances, he submitted that the provisions of the Bill were adequate.

*SIR JOHN BRUNNER said he had listened very carefully to the right hon. the Member for Cambridge University, and went entirely with him in his praise of the work of the County Councils and the County Boroughs under the Technical Instruction Act. That was a matter in which he had taken intense interest since 1889. He had watched the proceedings very closely of the Technical Instruction Committees in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Lancashire, Cheshire, and Devonshire; and when the right hon. Gentleman said that the constitution of the Technical Instruction Committee was the model which had been adopted in this Bill, he quite disagreed from him. He thought it was on account of the freedom enjoyed by these bodies that they did their work so well. This Bill was something entirely new to all our local government. In it there was no freedom, but only a liberty to propose to the Secretary to the Board of Education, who would dispose. He desired to see local government as thorough and effective as possible, and he felt convinced that as more freedom and more power and greater responsibility was given to these authorities, the more effective and efficient they would become. It had been said that these committees would differ in their method of work. Why should they not? The Technical Education Committee of London differed materially in their methods and curricula from those of Bradford or Leeds. Liverpool had not the same instruction to give as Manchester. Lancashire and Dorsetshire differed very widely, but why should they not? They knew the circumstances and position of those for whom they acted far better than the Board of Education possibly could and the people of Dorsetshire and Lancashire were not only satisfied but all the better off for the difference in their authorities. He asked the Committee not to introduce these new-fangled things, but to leave the new education authorities as free as the Technical Committees were today.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought the Committee ought, before half-past 7 o'clock, to get down to the words "Board of Education," and to add the proviso which had been agreed upon. He hoped the Committee would agree to this.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY ventured to think that of all the Amendments moved with the object of improving the machinery of this Bill, none had been put before the Committee so excellent in its purpose as the one moved by his hon. friend. His hon. friend had truly stated that if it was accepted it would get rid of the cumbrous procedure of this Bill. This Clause was a perfect mosaic of cumbrous provisions. It was only necessary to look at the Clause to see the necessity for this Amendment, or one of a like character. There were six Sections and several sub-Sections, the whole of which were elaborated to carry out in an extremely complicated fashion that which could be and had been done in the easiest possible manner. The hon. and learned Attorney General, in the first of his two speeches delivered this evening, had described the necessity of the scheme for the purpose of affording elasticity, but elasticity was the last thing that was needed by these committees. What was required was uniformity. The hon. Member for East Somerset had described these committees as compound bodies, and had said that in his opinion for the creation of these bodies it was absolutely necessary to have some scheme. There was no such necessity. These compound bodies already existed in the Technical Instruction Committees and the Library Committees, both of which had done excellent work. As an old member of a municipal corporation he entirely objected to this outside interference with local authorities. It would not be welcomed by them, and they could do their business much better without it. He thought the simple and easy solution of this matter was on the lines of the Amendment of his hon. friend, and therefore he supported it.

(7.8.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 241; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 478).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,Aug'stusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.(A.J.)Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Balfour,KennethR.(Christch.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles,T.Gibson(King'sLynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJA(Worc'r
Chamberlayne, T.(S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston,Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD(Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDix'n
Dorington,Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manor)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest

Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd. Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, William F (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Ford (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J E B. (Isle of Wight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chicester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuffnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sporston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J. A. (Gl'mrg'n, Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The next two Amendments seem to raise the same point, and the next, standing in the name of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, ought to have come in sub-Section. 2, sub-Section (*a*.)

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved to insert, after the words "Board of Education," the following proviso:—"Provided always that, if a Council having powers under Part II. only of this Act, determine that an Education Committee is unnecessary in their case, it shall not be obligatory on them to appoint such a committee."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he thought the Committee ought to have time to consider this proviso. There was a feeling on both sides that something of this kind should be done. He rather favoured the suggestion that these small bodies should not be allowed to appoint a committee at all. If they were given the power they were very likely to exercise it, and what the Committee had now t decide was whether it was desirable that these small Councils all over the country should have the power to appoint a committee. He did not think the Government would be wise in forcing this proviso through without some further discussion.

The Amendment was agreed to.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

EVENING SITTING.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means from this Evening's Sitting.

STANDING ORDER 56—PROCEDURE ON SETTING UP SUPPLY FOR "ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES."

(9.0.) On the Order for going into Committee of Supply,

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee), as a point of order, asked the Speaker's ruling on the question whether a Motion for going into Supply should be put from the Chair, seeing that within the sense of Standing Order 56 this was going into Supply for the first time. He did not know that it would give rise to any debate, but as the present procedure was admittedly exceptional and unprecedented, it was desirable to have a ruling upon it. Standing Order 56 prescribed that whenever Committee of Supply stood as the Order of the Day the Speaker should leave the Chair without putting any Question, unless on first going into Supply on the Army, Navy and Civil Service Estimates respectively. He submitted that, Supply having been closed and having been re-opened by the Resolution of the House on the preceding evening, they were now going into Supply on the Civil Service Estimates for the first time in the sense of the Standing Order, and that consequently the question ought to be put from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I have considered the question, and I have come to the conclusion that the present exceptional occasion is not going into Committee of Supply for the first time in the sense contemplated by the Standing Order. I cannot twice in the same session leave the Chair for the first time.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES (1902-3) ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE.

CLASS V.

£8,000,000, Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I have not the slightest intention of offering any opposition to the Vote. On the contrary, my feeling is that this is the most proper course that could be adopted, apart from the constitutional question as to the method with which the Vote has been brought forward. I think myself that the Government will require to make a further demand on the liberality of the House and the country for the purposes for which this Vote was proposed. Very likely at present there would be no advantage in asking for a rger sum than the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes, but hereafter I feel confident more will be required, and I for my part shall not hesitate to accede to the demand of the Government if they come forward hereafter and ask for a larger sum of money. Although I have not risen for the purpose of offering any opposition, I do want to say a very few words which I believe to be absolutely necessary. It would be useless entering upon old stories, or to revive past controversies with regard to the causes of the situation now existing, but I believe that the country is not at all apprised of the full extent of the misery and devastation in South Africa. We are bound by every obligation to do all we can for the purpose not of restoring the country to its former prosperity—that would not be practicable—but to enable the population to settle down and recommence their industries, chiefly agricultural, with some prospect of themselves bringing back the country to its former condition. I believe that our hope of reconciling the inhabitants to British rule will in a large measure depend on the generosity of this country. If we are to look forward to the r becoming contented citizens in the future, we must not merely try to get them to forget, by ourselves forgetting, the causes of the quarrel, but we must also get them to recognise that our rule is as benevolent as we are wealthy. It rests upon us to prove to them that we possess qualities which would make them value us as fellow-subjects, and I think that nothing better could be done in that direction than to show this liberal spirit. Very scanty information as to the condition of these countries has been published in the Press or in the Blue-books. There was, I know, about a year ago, a despatch issued, in which Lord Milner described the crippled state of the agricultural districts, and compared them with a desert. For six months after that Blue-book was issued the war went on, and it is not difficult to imagine that the misery and devastation thereby caused substantially increased the trouble. I hope we shall be told, in the course of this evening's debate, what has been done—and I hope a great deal has been done—to alleviate this state of affairs. But we do not know all. There has been no authoritative statement as to it, and the information coming through the Press has been extremely meagre. I think that the House, while quite right in voting, as I hope it will do, this money, ought to be informed what the true condition was at the conclusion of peace, and what steps have been taken, and with what success, for the purpose of restoring the prosperity of these countries, of replenishing the stock, and of rebuilding and repatriating the people to their farms. I think we ought to know, among other things, what is the number of persons still in the concentration camps—the number of men, women, and children. I am told—I hope I may be mis-informed—that there are still a large number there. I think we ought also to know what has been done in the way of bringing back the prisoners of war, and whether there is still any substantial number remaining in exile.

There is one other point to which I should like to refer. When a sum of £500,000 was voted a year ago, the application of it was, I think, left rather at large, and I do not know that there was any specific appropriation of it to any particular object. I gather from the despatches of Lord Milner that out of that £500,000, £400,000 has been spent in the purchase of farms which were in the market, with a view to carrying out a scheme of settlement. I do not think we are informed whether any portion of this present Vote can be applied to any such purpose as that, and I hope we shall be told whether it is intended to spend any of the grant in buying land with a view to a scheme of immigration. I do not intend to discuss that at any length, but I have been very much alarmed in reading the despatches of Lord Milner on this question of immigration and of putting British immigrants in possession of farms thus purchased. It must be remembered that a great many of the Boers who have lately been in arms against us have large farms. A very considerable number of them are held under mortgage, and, of course, during the three years that the war lasted payments have fallen into arrear, and the farmers may be liable to foreclosure at the instigation of those who lent the money. What I want to say is this. If there is a real market in which farms are genuinely offered, spontaneously and voluntarily, I can quite understand the policy of buying them with a view of satisfying some obligation that we contracted with those who went out to fight our battle. But what I would deprecate in the strongest possible manner is anything in the nature of taking advantage of the present necessities of these men, either by buying their mortgages or by the refusal of grants and pressing them to part with their land, or still more, using compulsory powers for the purpose of depriving them of a portion of their land. Lord Milner, in one of his despatches, suggests that in the case of a man with 5,000 acres, it might be legitimate to make him sell 4,000 acres, giving him, of course, the full market price, with a view to the new plan of settlement. I cannot imagine anything more disastrous than such a policy. If you do that you will, I think, to begin with, violate the terms of settlement, which prescribe that these men shall not be deprived of their property. Even if you have the right to do it under the terms of settlement, you could not undertake a more fatal or more disastrous policy. There is no means of reconciling these people except by endeavouring to replace them in their full proprietary rights and giving them assistance, so far as you can, in re-instating them in their holdings. These are the observations I wished to make, and I have only this to say in conclusion. I have, as every hon. Member knows, most strongly opposed the policy of the Colonial Secretary. I hope, however, that it may prove to be in the event a policy true and wise. I think it is our duty now to do everything we can to restore kindly feeling between our late enemies and ourselves, and, above all things, for that purpose it is essential not only to be just, not only to refrain from interfering with their property for the sake of any wild schemes that may be brought forward for immigration and settlement, but also to show that we are really desirous to be generous and to assist them in every way we can for the purpose of restoring prosperity to these colonies.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said he desired to make some remarks on the question of land settlement in South Africa. He had always felt that there was but one key to the solution of the South African problem—the problem which this war had left behind it, still unsolved and still fraught with great possibilities of Imperial gain and Imperial loss. He had always felt that the key was to be found in a large scheme of irrigation and colonisation. He must ask the permission of the House to make one or two remarks of a personal character, and he did so with the less hesitation because those remarks would show that he was adhering to his rule only to intrude upon the House on subjects of which he had some personal knowledge or with which he had some personal connection. Five years ago he engaged in a project of irrigation in the North West Territory of

Canada, a project which had been recognised by the Canadian Government as one of great importance and as forming the cradle of a new population for that vast and almost uninhabited country. From this experience he could put the financial aspect of the question into a nut-shell. Land which was practically unsaleable — they could not sell it for half a dollar per acre, at any rate— they had been selling from the first introduction of this irrigation project at from ten to fifteen dollars per acre, and it only cost three dollars per acre to irrigate it. The population was increasing by thousands. The problem they had to deal with was similar, in its main features, to that which now existed in South Africa. It was true it did not involve those political or Imperial considerations which, for his part, he thought made the South African problem far more pressing. It was true also that the physical conditions of the country were different to those which existed in South Africa, where it was imperative that any large scheme of irrigation should be undertaken by the State and the State only. In Southern Alberta there was a vast territory which was quite useless for the purpose of cultivation and was practically uninhabited. By the introduction, however, of water they had converted it into a country where a farmer could live and keep himself and family in comparative prosperity on 150 acres of land, to which he could add, if he liked, a portion of the hinterland of their water system for the purposes of ranching. The same conditions existed in South Africa and the same beneficent change could be effected there. He proposed to trouble the House with a somewhat detailed explanation, because he thought the comparison between the two cases was a pretty close one. They sold the land with the water right attached to it; the purchase money had to be paid back in ten annual instalments, and, until it was so paid, the settler did not receive his title. The purchase money covered the original cost of irrigation and the profits of the undertaking. In addition to the water right there was the water rental—so much per acre per year—which was retained in the hands of the central authority for maintenance and income. In South Africa the State would stand in the position of the central authority until the whole of the purchase money had been paid back by the settler, when the whole property in the undertaking—water, land, irrigation works and all — could pass to the freeholders under the same system as was practised in some of the Western States of America. For the purpose of constructing their irrigation works they used the labour of those whom they intended to become settlers, and they paid them——

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I think the hon. Gentleman is going rather far away from the Vote. It is not a Vote given for the purposes of irrigation; it is a Vote given to those who are already settled in South Africa, and who have suffered from the war.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: Of course, Sir, I cannot dispute your ruling. I understood that the £500,000 already granted to Lord Milner was part of this Vote. As I desired to confine my remarks to the question of irrigation and land settlement, I think I had better bring them to a conclusion and leave it for another occasion. But I should like to take your ruling whether I am not in order in suggesting that some of the money to be spent in resettling those who are now in South Africa should be spent on the lines I have indicated.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a Vote of money for necessaries for those in South Africa, and I think it would be rather remote to go into the question of water supply.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: My argument was that irrigation is one of the most pressing necessities of South Africa. Am I not entitled to put that forward?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: As a point of order, I would ask whether this money can be applied to any purpose other than that of the restoration of the burghers to their homes, and to supply them with any necessaries that may be required.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: And may I remind you, Sir, and the right hon. Gentleman as well, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his speech last

July, upon this question, distinctly stated that the subject of land settlement, and, I believe, of irrigation, would come under discussion when this vote was taken in the Autumn Session.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Not the three millions.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. Gentleman would be in order in discussing that question on this particular Vote. I must adhere to the terms of the Vote on the Paper.

(9.30.) *SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT I want to call the attention of the Committee especially to head No. 3 of the Vote ("Sum required for loans to be advanced by the Colonial Governments to supplement the grants under 1 and 2, such loans to be repayable as provided in the terms of surrender — £3,000,000"). I spoke last night on the subject of 1 and 2—£3,000,000 for free grants to burghers and £2,000,000 for grants to other persons in respect of war losses in the two colonies. There was some discussion of the nature of these grants. I have studied again the terms of surrender, and how any person reading these terms could for a moment have doubted that these were free grants which were to come out of the British Exchequer I cannot conceive. The words of the surrender are these:—

> "His Majesty's Government will place at the disposal of these commissions a sum of £3,000,000 for the above purposes"—

that is, for the purpose of the restoration of the people to their homes, who owing to the war losses are unable to provide themselves with food and shelter. It is indispensable to the resumption of their normal occupations. That is the object of the free gift. There is to be placed at the disposal of these commissions a sum of £3,000,000, and further to identify it it is said "in addition to the above mentioned free grant of £3,000,000." That is to make it quite clear that it was a free grant without any connection with any loan at all. It was a free gift by the British people out of their taxation. That seems to me so clear that I cannot conceive how anybody could ever entertain a doubt about it; but it seems to have been so misunderstood by the Government that when they announced this £3,000,000 they gave an assurance that it would be repaid by a loan levied on the Transvaal. That appears to have been an extraordinary misapprehension by the Government of the terms of the surrender to which they themselves had been a party. A statement was made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on June 4th, which I at the time earmarked. He said—

> "It is clearly understood that these £3,000,000 are to be advanced from the British Exchequer and repaid by a loan on the Transvaal, and, if so, it seems to me a sound and reasonable transaction to give the money at once when it is wanted by advance, and have it repaid by a loan afterwards when it is convenient to levy that loan."

That was the clear understanding. I, following the Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "The arrangement, then, is this. The £3,000,000 is to be advanced from the British Exchequer and is to be repaid by a loan upon the Transvaal."

That was accepted, and so we proceeded, and never was there a word said until this Vote was put forward on a totally different basis. That, of course, has upset the whole arrangements of the finance as they were announced at the end of the last meeting of Parliament. At the time the Colonial Secretary spoke, on July 29th, there was no statement of any other view on the subject at all. The result of that was that we received the amended Budget with the express statement on the printed paper that there would be available nearly £6,000,000 out of the Budget for the reduction of the British Debt. Of course this new paper that has come forward entirely upsets that financial result, because, whereas in the Paper presented on June 9th it was stated that out of the loan of £30,000,000 raised this year there would be left a sum of nearly £6,000,000 which would be so applicable, now the result of the Vote we are going to give tonight will be that out of this £6,000,000, £5,000,000 will have been removed from the office of reducing the British Debt. I do not object to that; but I say it is a very unfortunate circumstance that the Government should have so misapprehended their own arrangement that they should have held forth ever since last June to the country that their financial arrangements would enable them to reduce the Debt of the British taxpayer by about £6,000,000, whereas, in point of fact, it is now discovered that their arrangements require them to take almost the whole of that £6,000,000 and apply it to the purposes of the restoration of the ravages made by the war in South Africa, and that they are not to be recouped by a loan as was then held forth, so that ultimately the British taxpayer would recover the money he had advanced. That is one of the most extraordinary, in my experience, financial misapprehensions formed by a Government of a convention of which they themselves are the authors. Reading the document of surrender over again, it is utterly unintelligible to me how any statesman of ordinary intelligence could have arrived at the conclusion that this was not to be a free grant. I do not object to its being a free gift. It has been promised by the Government, and it is wanted—and I think a great deal more than £5,000,000 will be wanted—for the purpose of repairing the ravages of this war. My opinion is that very likely peace, before we have restored the country, will have cost as much as did the war.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): What! £228,000,000?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The right hon. Gentleman is one of those who told us that the war was going to cost us £10,000,000.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I never committed myself to anything like that.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, we know the calculations that were made of the probable cost of the war, and we know the estimates that were made of the number of troops that would probably be required. Therefore, the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me if I do not regard him as infallible on these subjects. I remember some time ago, at the beginning of the war, expressing a very different opinion of its probable cost and of the probable force that would be required, and the right hon. Gentleman very amiably told me that he was an optimist and that I was a pessimist. The only reply I thought it necessary to make was that I was sorry to say that the optimists were always wrong and the pessimists always turned out right. That that has been so in the last three years nobody can deny. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman is going to say tonight that he thinks this devastated country can be restored at a cost of £3,000,000. I do not think it can. I am pessimist enough to say that I do not think £3,000,000 will restore the condition of South Africa as it is at present. Therefore I am not the person to object to this country and South Africa, the Transvaal and the Colonies, and even the favoured owners of the gold mines, contributing to that cost, whatever it may be. It is a disappointment to me, no doubt, that I find that the owners of the gold mines are not to contribute, as we were told they were to contribute under the loan, to any part of this money we are going to vote tonight; but as the Government has promised it shall be given by us without any return, it should be, and it is quite right that that sum of £5,000,000 should be given, not only £3,000,000 to the Dutch, but also, of course, to those who are not Dutch, to British subjects and subjects of other nations who have suffered in the war.

Therefore I do not object to No. 1 and No. 2, but I may be permitted to express my disappointment that we are not to be recouped that money ultimately, as was promised by the Government in June last. However, that cannot be helped. The Government were under a delusion upon the subject, and, of course, the promise must be fulfilled as it was made. But I desire to express my opinion that a great deal more than £5,000,000 will be required for the purposes which are named in Clauses 1 and 2 of this Vote. At the time of the surrender the sum of £3,000,000 was accompanied by a statement that, in addition to the free grant of £3,000,000,

> "His Majesty's Government would be prepared to make advances on loan for the same purposes free of interest for two years, and afterwards repayable over a period of years with 3 per cent. interest. No foreigner or rebel will be entitled to the benefit of this Clause."

The loan spoken of there is not a loan to be raised by the English Government or by the Government of the Transvaal. The loan there is to small people to whom the money is lent, and who are to repay it on those terms. But this loan reappears in Clause 3, in which the sum "required for loans to be advanced by the Colonial Government" is spoken of. But I find nothing in the terms of the surrender to say that it is the Colonial Government who are to advance these loans. I do not know whether the Government are in the same haze upon this subject as they were upon the £3,000,000, as to who is to advance these loans. I find nothing in the terms of surrender corresponding to this statement—

> "The loans promised by the terms of surrender are to be made by the Colonial Government out of their own funds."

That is the translation of the words—

> "In addition to the above-named free grant of £3,000,000, His Majesty's Government will be prepared to make advances on loan."

I do not know what view the Colonial Government will take on the subject. They may say, apparently with great truth, on reading the terms of surrender, that, as the free grant was to come from the British Exchequer, so the loans are to come from the British Exchequer, and, therefore, you may have exactly the same muddle over this question of the loans that you have had over the question of the free grant.

Now, let us go on, because the terms of this Vote have no correspondence whatever to the terms of surrender.

> "The present provision is required merely as a temporary advance to enable those Governments to proceed with the loans until such time as the necessary funds can be raised on their own behalf."

That is a clear statement that these loans are, unlike the Free Grant, to be a really temporary advance, and that the loans are to be charged on the Colonies. That may be so. Of course that is a favourable arrangement to the British taxpayer, but will it turn out to be well founded?

> "The amount so advanced will be repaid by the colonies out of the proceeds of the first loan raised by them."

That is exactly the arrangement that was promised in respect of the free gift. I can find nothing in the terms of surrender which makes the loan stand on a different footing, or would prevent the Colonial Government saying, "You undertook the loan as you undertook the free gift." That is a point that ought to be cleared up. I understand that the Boers objected to the £3,000,000 being placed on the Transvaal. I can understand that, because they will be resident in the Transvaal, and would have to pay their share of the interest on the loan. I say also that, as there is nothing in the terms of surrender to place the loan on a different footing from the free gift, they are entitled to say to the Government, "As you were mistaken about the free gift, you may be also mistaken about the loan."

As to the loan itself, I do not think it is too large. Indeed, I think it is a great deal too small, having regard to the miserable condition of the Colonies which require instant repair. From what I can gather these £3,000,000 will be—I will not say a mere drop in the ocean—but certainly they will be quite insufficient to place the burghers in a position to carry on the industry. I do not ask the amount of the loan you are to guarantee; I know that will be a subject of careful consideration by the Colonial Secretary, who, we are glad to know, is going to inquire into the matter on the spot. For my part, I should be glad if the Colonial Secretary had a much larger sum at his disposal for the purpose, if necessary, of restoring the condition of the country which has been devastated by the war.

SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth) said he would not follow the right hon. Gentleman in the question of who had been right or wrong in the past; all he was concerned about was that the money now to be voted should be so expended that we obtained our money's worth from the Colonies in the future. The reward we hoped for from the vast expenditure incurred in the war, and the sacrifice of so many lives, was a happy and prosperous South Africa. The country could not be happy without being prosperous, and the object which should be aimed at in the spending of the money was to assure that prosperity. He believed the one thing absolutely necessary was a plentiful supply of labour at a not too prohibitive cost.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton), rising to a point of order, asked whether it was in order to raise the question of labour in the mines.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said he understood the hon. Baronet to refer to labour on the land. If, however, he proposed to deal with the question of labour in the mines he should be obliged to rule his remarks out of order.

SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON said that in that event he should conclude his remarks. The whole of his argument was intended to show how some of the money could be got back by ensuring a supply of labour in the mines.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Baronet proposes to deal with the question of labour in the mines, I shall be obliged to rule the discussion out of order.

SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON said that in that event he should conclude his remarks. The whole of his argument was intended to show how some of the money could be got back by ensuring a supply of labour in the mines.

(9.55.) MR. LABOUCHERE said he had no objection to the debate taking that line, but he wished simply to obtain a ruling from the Chair as to whether they might take that line or not. He thought it would be unjust to levy the £3,000,000 on the Transvaal, and he agreed with his right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth that the amount of the loan was too small. He knew perfectly well that they could not now move an addition, but he thought he might move an Amendment on the ground that this sum was too small. He was not prepared to move a reduction of £100 in order to establish that view, but he would ask the Colonial Secretary to take into consideration what had really been going on in the Transvaal. It was generally admitted that that country was an absolute desert. What was happening at the present moment they really could not judge of from the information which they received in the newspapers. The wildest and most contradictory statements as to the condition of South Africa were made on both sides. According to the official statement, only 400 farms had been burnt, but General De Wet declared that the ravaged farms numbered as many as 30,000. This was such an enormous difference that, in considering what amount they ought to give to these unfortunate burghers, they should distinctly know what the information of the Colonial Secretary was at the present time on the subject, and whether the devastation really was so great as had been stated by the Boer generals, whose statements were certainly believed by a very large number of persons. With reference to the £2,000,000 he noticed that it was to be given to "other persons." He supposed that meant those who were not engaged in war against us, but he desired to know if the mine owners were included in "other persons."

He should like the Colonial Secretary to tell them who were the "other persons." There were losses incurred by large and small mine owners, and he wished to know if the Colonial Secretary included them in "other persons." He wished to know if the losses incurred by the mining companies in any sort of way, either directly or indirectly, were to be recouped out of this £2,000,000? Another question he would ask was when it was spoken of as "other persons," did it merely mean the people in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony who had suffered losses, or did it include the people in Cape Colony and Natal? If it did include Cape Colony and Natal he did not think they ought to be included, because they were self-governing Colonies, and if they had sustained any losses owing to the war, those losses ought to be paid by the inhabitants of Natal and Cape Colony. The £3,000,000 was undoubtedly necessary, but he regretted that there had been delays already in providing this money for the Boers. He thought it was a pity that the money was not at once voted last session and applied immediately to the purpose to which it was pledged by the treaty. It was stated that this money would form part of a loan to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. He supposed that Natal and Cape Colony were not included. This loan would be a Colonial loan in the sense that the Colonies would be responsible for the payment of the interest, but this country would have to guarantee the loan. It would be interesting to know what the amount of the loan would be. He thought this point was in order, because they were told that this would be part and parcel of the loan. He wanted to know what amount the Transvaal would be able to pay. Perhaps the Colonial Secretary would tell the Committee whether the large force of constabulary was to be maintained by this country, what the amount of the cost of the excess in the Army in South Africa due to the war—over and above what the Army was before the war—would be, and whether it would be paid by this country? Broadly he wished to have the right hon. Gentleman's own opinion as to what the cost of the administration of the new Colonies, inclusive of the police force, would be. He was sorry that the hon. Member for Westminster was not in order, because he should have had much pleasure in making some observations on his statement. The hon. Gentleman was not his Member, although he was one of the hon. Member for Westminster's constituents, but, while he entirely disagreed with him, he must congratulate the hon. Member upon having been in an exceedingly good business.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS rose to a point of order, and asked if the hon. Member for Northampton was in order in pursuing the very subject for discussing which he himself had been ruled out of order.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will not be in order in pursuing that subject.

MR. LABOUCHERE said he would not pursue the subject, and all he wished to do was simply to congratulate the hon. Gentleman.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he wished to ask the Colonial Secretary a question in regard to the second item on the Paper. He wished to know if the money was going to be confined entirely to the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal, or whether any part of it would be applied to persons in Natal and Cape Colony. It was exceedingly difficult very often to tell where war losses had been actually incurred, but they knew that very considerable losses had been sustained by the loyalists in Cape Colony and Natal, and it was very important that they should know if they would be entitled to share in this grant of £2,000,000. Another question he wished to put was as to how the sum of £2,000,000 would be allocated. He desired to know whether all persons would have a right to go before the courts and make their claims, or would the disposal of this sum be left entirely in the hands of Lord Milner. He would only say one word in regard to the £3,000,000 granted to the burghers. He thought all persons who looked at this matter from an impartial point of view would say that this was an exceedingly generous sum to give them. Whether it was enough or not it was quite impossible to say. He had taken considerable pains to find out how much would be necessary, but no exact calculation could be made to show what amount would be required to assist the burghers of the late Republics in the restoration of their homes. No doubt there would be ample opportunity of spending £8,000,000 or any other sum, but he thought £3,000,000 was an exceedingly generous allowance. He wished to point out that the issuing of this loan at 3 per cent. interest was about half the interest at which sums were advanced in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony; therefore he thought that this was again a very generous contribution to the two Republics. It was greatly to be regretted that some parts of the two colonies were in a state of devastation, but that was absolutely inevitable from the war, and it must not be forgotten that the war was not caused by us, and therefore this country was being very generous indeed in granting these sums from Imperial funds for those purposes.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said that he did not rise to oppose the Vote which was at present before the Committee, but he wished to complain that the Colonial Secretary had not given them the information to which they were entitled, considering that the British taxpayers had to find this money, and it would have to be paid from British funds. Only that afternoon he asked how much of the free grant to burghers had been issued, and he was told that the sum already distributed amounted to £1,500,000. He also asked upon what system the grant had been distributed, but he did not receive any information upon this point at question time, and all he was told was that the money had been issued under Article 10 of the terms of peace. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would now be able to tell them something in regard to the principles upon which these amounts had been distributed in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. He understood that this money had been credited to them, and the burghers were held to be debtors to the Government for those amounts. If that were so the amount of book-keeping that would be entailed by those transactions would be something enormous. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to tell them how many burghers had been repatriated, and how many had received the benefit of half the sum which was to be devoted to their repatriation. He also wished to know how much money out of this fund had been paid to the military for the animals which they had supplied. He understood that something like £1,000,000 had been paid to the military authorities for the horses, mules, and the oxen which they had supplied. He should like to know whether they had been overpaid for them or not. He had heard that the prices charged by the military for those animals in the Transvaal were exorbitant, and in some places many animals were sold by public auction that were diseased, and they were the means of spreading disease. At Bloemfontein very great complaint was made that horses with glanders had been sold by the military to the burghers, and a few days afterwards those very same horses had to be destroyed by order of the civil authorities, and consequently that caused a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the local purchasers. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] If the military authority sold horses with glanders did hon. Gentlemen opposite think that this would not cause dissatisfaction, especially when they had to have those horses destroyed by order of the civil government without compensation? Those people naturally looked upon it as sharp practice that diseased animals were sold to them which had afterwards to be destroyed.

There had also been a great deal of complaint in the two Colonies that the military authorities had charged very large sums for their oxen and mules. It had been freely stated that Lord Kitchener at the end of the war had totted up more than the full value of all the horses, mules, oxen, and waggons, and that they were sold to the Repatriation Board for the sum which he had placed upon them. It was also stated that the Repatriation Board had come to a standstill on account of the exorbitant prices put upon these animals by the military authorities, because practically the whole of the transport of the country at the close of the war belonged to the military authorities. He wished to know whether those statements were correct or not, because if they were incorrect the military authorities ought to be cleared from that imputation. There had undoubtedly been a considerable amount of delay in giving out the cattle and stocking the burghers with oxen, mules, and waggons, and also with seed corn because the season for sowing in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony had just passed and if the seed corn had not been supplied in time, of course the burghers would have nothing upon which to maintain themselves during the next year. This had been a subject of great complaint, because it would create a thriftless class who would remain in the concentration camps, subsisting upon the free rations provided by the Government. Of course it was very easy to criticise these matters, but he did not wish in the least to criticise too severely anything which had been done by the Repatriation Board, because he was aware that if they had to distribute this money in kind and create the organisation for this, there must be a great deal of dissatisfaction. He trusted that, when the right hon. Gentleman went over to South Africa, he would see that as many Boers as possible were placed in a position to help themselves to earn their own living instead of remaining in the concentration camps.

There were at present a large number of horses in the hands of the military authorities which were not being used, and these would have been a great benefit to the burghers had they been distributed. He could not help feeling great apprehension as to the feelings of the burghers when they came back to a country which was devastated. There was absolutely no cultivation, the whole of the stock had been destroyed, and there were hardly any houses standing. When the burghers returned and found that they had actually no home, and that no cultivation was going on, he almost shuddered to anticipate what would be their feelings. Some hon. Members had questioned whether £5,000,000 would be enough to bring back the country to its normal condition. He thought that was practically impossible with that amount of money. They would not get anything like the conditions that existed before the war for such a sum. They should remember that the cattle imported into South Africa had to be acclimatised. The late Mr. Rhodes imported stock from Australia and most of them died; and it should be remembered that Australia was a much better country to import stock from than this country. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman in all seriousness whether it was wise policy for him to introduce the system of loans for the burghers. These loans would, some time or other, have to be repaid, and it would be a very difficult matter to recover them. He could imagine nothing that could lead to greater ill-will between the creditor nation and the burghers than that they should have to refund this money. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would give them some information on these points, and he congratulated him most heartily upon his visit to South Africa, and hoped that he would be able to do something to settle that very disturbed country.

(10.19.) MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: As the few remarks which I shall now have to address to the Committee will probably form the last, or, at all events, one of the last speeches, which I shall offer to the House before I leave for South Africa, it is my earnest desire that they shall not partake of a controversial character. I cannot help, however, inquiring what hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen on the other side think is to be gained by the sort of discussion which has been raised to-day. I imagine that it is their desire, as it is mine, that I should proceed upon this visit which I have undertaken with a mind as open and as unprejudiced as possible. And yet the apparent object of this debate is to commit me beforehand for or against certain principles which are being laid down by hon. Gentlemen opposite. I could not fully answer the questions which have been addressed to me without stating very clearly my present view, if I have a view, upon the subjects which have been raised. I do not want to put myself in that position. I go to South Africa with the predetermination to listen there to everything that may be said to me. I will not say by every individual—that would prolong my tour to an extent that I have not yet contemplated—but, at all events, to every representative man and every representative body who has a right to be heard. To all of them my ears will be open, and I do not want them to think I have made up my mind on disputed questions before I have heard them. With that prefatory observation, which will prevent me from going into a number of the questions which have been asked me, I will do my best to refer to one or two matters of principle that have been raised, and I will also give an answer to one or two questions of detail which appear to me to be not of the slightest importance under the existing circumstances, but which out of courtesy to hon. Members I will do my best to answer.

The hon. Member who has just sat down, the hon. Member for South Molton, has stated—Heaven knows where he got it from—that the Government of the Transvaal has expended the money which was intended for the benefit of the burghers of the Transvaal in purchasing horses that have got glanders from our own officers, and the hon. Gentleman asked me for information on this subject.

MR. LAMBERT: I said the military had been selling horses at Bloemfontein; not in the Transvaal.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I see, in the Orange River Colony. I do not see that that changes the issue. The particular question arises at Bloemfontein, and not at Pretoria. Now, I would give the hon. Gentlemen a principle. In my opinion it is absolutely impossible for the Colonial Secretary, or what is commonly called Downing Street, to deal with every matter of detail in the administration of something like forty countries off its own bat. That is absolutely absurd and ridiculous, and we have, therefore, to trust to those whom we appoint. We have to take, in the first instance, the greatest possible care, to secure that the best man is selected for the particular work which is required to be done, but having done so, and until it is conclusively proved to us that he is unworthy of our confidence, we have to place our confidence in him in regard to all matters of detail, and give him general instructions as to the lines of his policy and the principles he is to pursue. As to any attempt on my part, or the part of my Department, to look into and examine every detail of a transaction which involves the expenditure of millions of money, I can only say that not only will I absolutely refuse to undertake it, but I should think any man was a lunatic to undertake it. What, after all, does it amount to? It amounts to this—I do not see my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War present on this occasion, but I think if he had been present he would have felt that he had his triumph. It is always the custom to contrast the War Office unfavourably with other Departments of State, but here a Gentleman on the other side of the House informs the House from information he has received that in a great transaction which has taken place at Bloemfontein the War Office has got considerably the better of the Colonial Office. I do not know whether that is so or not. What I do know is that at the close of the war the War Office—that is to say, the military—were in possession of enormous quantities of stock, mule-wagons, ox-wagons, and stores, of every kind and description, including the celebrated blockhouses, which will always form a very important and romantic incident in the war. These under ordinary circumstances they would have disposed of to the best advantage in the market. They would have sold them to the burghers, and not only to the burghers but to the citizens of the two colonies generally, and they would probably have got a much better price than they did in the arrangement we made with them. We said, and they agreed, that this was a matter of high policy, and not a question of one Department getting a few pounds more or a few pounds less from another Department, which does not in the slightest degree affect the finances of the kingdom. We agreed that it was a matter of high policy that everything that could by any possibility be useful in the resettlement of the country should at once be transferred to the civil authorities. That was done; we came to an amicable agreement as to the price; we did not attempt to haggle about the price of a mule, or a donkey, or an ox, or a wagon; but we put the whole together, and, having examined it carefully by means of an inter-departmental committee, we settled the total sum to be paid, which amounts to considerably over a million sterling. This sum is now represented by goods either already in possession of the burghers or still under the control of Lord Milner and the civil administration for the purpose of the repatriation which is going on.

The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dumfries Burghs in my absence asked me one or two questions to which I desire to reply. He inquired as to the numbers in the concentration camps. At the close of the war the number of persons in concentration camps was about 103,000—men, women, and children. At the present moment—I am obliged to use rough figures, for they change every week, but I give the information as far as I have it—the number is 34,000. I marvel when I think what the local administration has done. A great war which has lasted over two and a half years, which as hon. Members say has no doubt caused great suffering and devastated the country, has come to an end, and within a few months of the close of that war we have been able to help to repatriate something like 70,000 persons. Let it not be thought that we keep one man, woman, or child there against their will, or unless we are convinced that to allow them to go would be to expose them to suffering, and possibly to death. The numbers in the camps at the present time have been increased by the practical necessities of the situation. We have to move these people to their farms. We have to see before we move them that we can supply them with the means of subsistence for a reasonable time, and that thereafter our transport is sufficient to keep them supplied, and as the prisoners return from the distant countries in which they have been interned they also in many cases go to our concentration camps as a sort of intermediate state before they are placed on the farms. At the present moment, in addition to the 34,000 I have already mentioned, there are a great number of persons who have come in, since the war, to concentration camps as camps of refuge, and of prisoners who have also adopted the same position. Need I explain to the House, what must be in the mind of every Member, that these camps, which are costing us £200,000 a month, are camps the dispersal of which we should see with the greatest satisfaction. We would have closed the camps the day the war was over had we not known that, as a matter of certainty, it would have involved the deaths of thousands and tens of thousands of women and children whom we ought to protect. The hon. and learned Gentleman also asked a question as to the number of prisoners returned and still to come. There again I must ask the hon. and learned Gentleman not to hold me too tightly to the figures I give. Originally there were 24,000 prisoners from South Africa. Fourteen thousand have already returned and 7,000 are bound to be repatriated before the end of the year, and the remainder in a very short time after. There also he will understand that every prisoners' camp costs us an enormous sum of money. To a small nation it would be ruinous; to a big nation it is considerable. It is our desire to break the camps up at the earliest possible moment, but we have to consider what would be the result of throwing into South Africa under existing circumstances a number of people for whom provision has not yet been made.

Let me next deal very shortly with what seems to me to be a technical question, raised last night by the Member for West Monmouthshire. The right hon. Gentleman, if he will excuse me, has a habit of always endeavouring, whether in the House or outside of it, to prove that his opponents are either knaves or fools. On the present occasion he seems to be doubtful, but we really have only those two alternatives to choose from. If we, knowing that a heavy charge of this kind would be placed upon the Imperial funds, deceived the House of Commons by telling it that we expected to get the sum out of the Transvaal loan, then we are knaves. If we did not know, then we are fools. No doubt as their leader the right hon. Gentleman fully expressed the feelings of hon. Members behind him. Oh! I beg the pardon of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. I forgot that he was the Leader.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has forgotten something else. He appealed to the House to deal with this matter in a friendly and in a non-controversial spirit. He is not doing so himself.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh! I see. I shall try to follow the right hon. Gentleman. What I said was that I would endeavour, as far as I could, to deal with the matter in a non-controversial spirit. I made no appeal to the House. I said that, as far as I could, I should deal with it in that spirit. Where is the matter of controversy between us? I spoke of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire as their Leader. Is that a matter of controversy? [Cries of "Oh, oh," and an HON. MEMBER: "Shame."]

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): That is very small.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am glad to have the opinion of so good a judge. The right hon. Gentleman cannot have it both ways. There was nothing controversial in what I said until the right hon. Gentleman interrupted me. Now I go back to where I was when the right hon. Gentleman interrupted me. I venture humbly to submit to the Committee that this matter does not come under either of the categories I have described. We did not intentionally deceive the House. That is my first position. We declared—it was published in the Blue-books and in all the papers—at a very early period during the war that we would insist upon compensation for loyal subjects and for those who had suffered unjustly by the war, and that we should exact—or, rather, require, to use a less harsh word—compensation in the shape of a contribution from the two colonies. I agree that I made another statement. I admit that I thought it was generally understood—I know that it was understood by Lord Milner and Lord Kitchener, that I can answer for—that the grant, which is called a free grant, which was to be made for the repatriation of the burghers, was to come from the loan that was to be raised on the security of the Transvaal. That was our opinion, and under the influence of that opinion we told the House of Commons that a vote would not be required for that purpose. Almost immediately we heard, I think it was General Botha—I am speaking from memory, but, at all events, it was one of the signatories of the terms of surrender—called Lord Milner's attention to this point, and said that those who had signed the terms of surrender had believed that the grant that was to be made was to be made by the Imperial Government from the Imperial funds and not from Transvaal funds.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: So it is still.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am sorry to say (not in any controversial spirit) that I do differ from the right hon. Gentleman. My view is that it is a question which might very fairly be argued by lawyers, and that, probably, if we went on the letter of the agreement we should be held to be in the right in our view that, under the terms of the agreement, the charge should be one on the Transvaal loan. But we never entered upon that kind of consideration. We felt, just as much as hon. Gentlemen opposite, that when we entered into an arrangement of this kind it was above all things desirable that, if possible, both parties should feel that the terms of the convention were carried out, not merely in the letter, but also in the spirit. That does not mean that we should always adopt the views of the other party to the question, for there may be questions on which we shall have to insist upon our own interpretation of terms. But in this case we did not think that the matter was of sufficient importance to justify us in hesitating for a moment, and when these representations were made to us on behalf of the Boer signatories to the terms of surrender we at once yielded to them. Therefore it is that, without having changed our minds, without having any intention of deceiving the House of Commons, we now put before you the proposition, which is undoubtedly different, although I do not think that the difference is very substantial, from the proposition which we laid before you in June last. I hope, at all events, that I have made the matter absolutely clear to the Committee. I do not think I can go beyond that.

Now, Sir, coming to the merits of the Vote, I admit that I do not think that the sentiments expressed by hon. Gentlemen opposite will contribute to the success of the mission I have undertaken. After all, I confess, as I am perfectly ready to confess, that I do not know everything about South Africa. I admit that there is much that I have to learn. I am anxious to hear all sides, but what is perhaps a more important feature of such a visit, I am anxious to find myself in an atmosphere which is permeated with what I may call, in the best sense of the word, the best South African policy. If I admit that, surely hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite will admit that they have even less reason to be dogmatic or to speak with confidence of the present situation and future of South Africa. They, then, should do their best to help me. It is under these circumstances that we are told that the expenses of the peace will equal the expenses of the war. I cannot help pointing out the extreme exaggeration of a statement of that kind. The war has cost us 228 millions. Does the right hon. Gentleman, who has been called a pessimist, think in his most pessimistic moments that the peace expenses which we are incurring, or that we ought to incur, will reach anything like that sum? Does the right hon. Gentleman, or any of his friends, think that we will incur in peace an expenditure of £228,000,000? The right hon. Gentleman declares that the country is devastated; he speaks of the destitute condition of the population. Sir, I will not speak of that, because that is one of the things which I am going to see for myself. But I am forced by the course that the debate has taken to put in a *caveat*. In one sense there is great devastation. I have said before to the House, and I have been cheered by hon. Gentlemen opposite, you cannot make war without suffering on both sides, and I think we ought to be thankful that is the case, or else there would be many more wars. You cannot expect or ask, after people have been at war, and been beaten—this has nothing to do with the rights of the matter, but merely with the facts—that they should be put back into the same position in which they were before. And here I state one of the general principles to which I may commit myself without being considered to be prejudiced. Sir, the defeated party in a war must suffer more than the victors. That appears to me to be common sense, and cannot be contravened. But I do not admit of my own knowledge at present that although the country has suffered tremendously in material matters—I do not speak of the terrible suffering in regard to the loss of life and the despair and distress of those who have lost their relatives and friends —but although the country has suffered enormously in material matters, that is another side and a very important side. When, for instance, the Boer Generals or their representatives have said in other countries that the £3,000,000 which we offered them was a derisory dole, and that they required £75,000,000, I venture respectfully to differ from them, unless their contention is that, having been defeated in war, they are to be put in a better position than they were before the war. One thing is certain. The property of the ordinary Boer consisted in his farm, in his farmhouse and buildings, in his cattle and his stock. No doubt in very many cases his farmhouse has suffered or been actually destroyed and his cattle have been taken; although there are, according to the latest return, a very large number of cattle and stock still in the two colonies, but only a fraction of what there was before the war. But the land, which, after all, is his principal capital asset, has increased in value since the war, and I am informed—I speak only from information—that the average value of land in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony at the present time is very much greater than it was before the war. That is one of the things, then, that have to be taken into account. When we are told that the money we are offering as a free gift—and a sum to which we have put no limit at present, but for which today we are asking £3,000,000 in order to be able to loan it to those burghers who are in a better position and can afford to pay interest after a period of two years—when we are told that that is insufficient, I say that such judgments are entirely premature, and it is only my desire as far as possible to avoid pledging myself to any total that leads me to leave the matter there and not to continue my argument.

But there is one other point of great importance, on which I think that right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and certainly some of the representatives of the Boers, have misapprehended the situation. We offered £3,000,000 of money of our own accord. It was a voluntary offer. We were not asked for that amount, and I believe a less amount would have been accepted. At all events, be that as it may, we offered that amount as a free grant. For what? There seems to be in some persons' minds the idea that that was offered as compensation for war losses to those who had been our enemies. Well, surely that would have been a perfectly monstrous proposition. It is quite true that General Botha, in May 1901, and again the signatories for the surrender the other day, asked that this money, or some sum, should be set aside in order to pay notes and receipts which had been given by them in connection with their requisitions. But I beg the House to observe the difference between the proposal which was made to us at that time and the proposal to which we actually assented. It is an important difference, which really is a matter of principle. We refused to pay those loans. Why, a note might have been given to a man of substance—a gentleman of large property—a note might have been given to him for a portion of his stock, and I should say undoubtedly under those circumstances that if he lost his money it was a loss which he must take as many loyal subjects have had to take losses, as a necessary consequence of the war. The people we have to care about are two classes. But first the destitute, the widows and orphans—the people who would starve but for our assistance—and secondly, the people who, not being actually destitute, are, nevertheless, without the requisite means of restoring the industry in which they had been engaged previously to the war. Those are the two classes and the only two classes, which we take into account. We agree that the notes and the receipts should be received by us as evidence of war losses—that is to say, of evidence that destitution, where it existed, had been caused by the war. We do not engage to pay those notes or receipts unless the parties require money in order to enable them to recover their position and means of subsistence. Now, Sir, for the purpose which we had in view, that is to say, the relief of the people who are absolutely destitute from any fear of starvation, or any misery approaching starvation, and, in the second place, enabling all people to work the land which belongs to them and for which at present they have not the necessary capital—if the money which we are to devote to that purpose should be insufficient, I, for one, should not hesitate to come for more. But I say, so far as I know, as I am at present advised, I believe the money which the House has granted is sufficient for that purpose.

The hon. Member for Northampton, while expressing his readiness to vote more money for those who have been fighting against us, expressed some objection, as I understood him, to giving any money at all to those who fought for us. He wanted to know why this £2,000,000 was asked for. Well, Sir, the £2,000,000 has nothing whatever to do with the loans in Natal and Cape Colony. For those we have provided otherwise. We have undertaken with the Government of Natal to repay to them the compensation which they have given to those loyal subjects who were injured by the invasion. And we desire, and intend that it shall be given on a liberal scale. We have also agreed that a contribution shall be given to those loyal subjects who in the Cape Colony have suffered by the first invasion. I say the first invasion, because we consider that in the case of the second invasion the responsibility lies with the Colony itself. But with regard to the compensation which we are to give in the Cape Colony, we have expressed in the clearest terms our determination that not one penny of Imperial money shall be given to compensate those who have rebelled against the Imperial authority. That, as I say, is independent of the Vote tonight, and I merely introduced it because the question was raised by the hon. Member for Northampton. The Vote tonight is for those loyal British and Dutch subjects, of whom there are many, who stood by us in the conflict, and who have suffered loss in the two Colonies. Lord Milner is of opinion that the sum will enable him to compensate those persons in a larger measure, with a greater percentage of their loss, than in the case of those who fought against us. I think that is fair. I think it is right, and I do not think any impartial man can contravene it. It is right that the principle should be clearly stated, for here we are creating for the first time in the history of the world a new precedent. We have often been referred to the great civil war in America as an instance of the magnanimity which victorious troops and victorious Governments could show to those who had opposed them. Yes, I admit that up to that time no greater instance of magnanimity had ever transpired. But we are going much beyond that. The Northern States of America had, necessarily, in the course of the war, with that higher humanity—because, after all, it is a higher humanity—which exercises severity in order to shorten a war, desolated a gigantic extent of territory. Sherman's march had made a desert of fifty miles of country on each side of his route. For all that desolation the Northern States of America gave not one penny. They gave pensions to those who had suffered in the war, to those who were related to them in a distant degree; but to those who had fought on the other side not one farthing.

I say, therefore, that under these circumstances we are making a new precedent, and in actually giving, I will not call it compensation, but assistance to those who were our former enemies, we should clearly state what are the reasons. The reasons are humanity and policy. Humanity first, because we do not wish, under the British flag, that anyone should be subjected to the misery which these people would otherwise have to suffer. But policy because, as we have said over and over again, we have got to live together and want to live together. We hope that we shall live together as friends. We have absolutely no vindictive feelings towards those who, by superior force, we have conquered, but whose merits and qualities we are the first to recognise. We say it is good policy that these men should not be discontented, but that as far as possible we should enable them, not indeed to place themselves in the same position in which they would have been if there had been no war, but at all events to place themselves in a position in which they may recover their former prosperity. I think I have said all I need to say, all I ought to say, and my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth, as I shall call him on this occasion, at any rate, will, I think, agree with me in this case, at any rate, it is wise to be an optimist. Let us believe in the future and the future will answer our anticipations. I do believe in the future. To my mind what has been done in the short period that has elapsed since this desolating war was brought to an end is the greatest encouragement that we could possibly have. I did not mind saying to my own friends—I do not think I ever talked of it in this House—that at the end of the war I anticipated that the prisoners would not be repatriated for at least a period of three years. They will be all repatriated within twelve months of the close of the war. I could not have conceived that 70,000 men, women and children would have been able safely to leave the camps in which they have found homes for so long and be restored to their farms, no doubt suffering many annoyances and considerable hardships, but still without any fear of serious danger. I want to say that up to the present time the results of our efforts at re-settlement and repatriation have exceeded my most sanguine anticipations. And I hope I may have even greater cause for congratulation when I go to South Africa, going as I shall do with the most earnest desire to forget all that is controversial, all that is unhappy in regard to the recollections of the past, and with the one sole desire to bring together the people, a kindred people after all, separated only by the circumstances of recent times—to bring together this kindred people in one great African nation under the British Crown.

(11.0.) Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir, I have no desire whatever to find fault with, or to criticise in any way, the tone in which the right hon. Gentleman has concluded his speech. I envy him his extreme optimism, but I am quite willing to wish that we could all share it. [Ministerial cries of "Why not?"] I say, I wish we could all see reasons to feel the degree of optimism he expresses, but I think it is not only natural that he should entertain that feeling—I think it is the very best spirit in which he could go to South Africa—and I most earnestly hope, as I am sure we all do, that his mission to South Africa will be followed by the success he thinks may come from it. But the right hon. Gentleman began his speech in a way which does not commend itself to me. He began by inviting the House, as I understood him, to a calm and unheated and uncontroversial discussion of this matter, which certainly was a reasonable expectation to form in the circumstances in which we find ourselves to-day. But the right hon. Gentleman may not be aware of the contemptuous tone into which he immediately entered in the answers to the questions which were addressed to him. [Ministerial cries of "No."] I am in the recollection of the House and of those hon. Members who heard him. The way in which he spoke of the hon. Member for South Molton, the way in which he spoke in answer to my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth, attributing to him the position of thinking that every one opposed to him must be either a fool or a knave, was not a very friendly or kindly way of expressing his sentiments. These were not the methods in which to provoke a right feeling in the House, and I will say more, it was not the way to treat the House of Commons by any Minister, however distinguished he may be. But the right hon. Gentleman, I daresay, is a little *tête montée* at this moment. The right hon. Gentleman was entirely unjustified in saying that there was any desire or that there had been any attempt to commit him to any opinion. What we are doing tonight is obeying the invitation and the promise held out by the right hon. Gentleman himself in July last, when he said that in the course of the Autumn sittings there would be an opportunity for him to state to the House the exact position reached in South African affairs and for the House to express its opinion and come to a judgment. We refrained from expressing opinions for the reason that the right hon. Gentleman appealed to us. "Why should we dogmatise?" he asks. No one has dogmatised. What we have asked for is information on a great many important points on which light seemed to be required. There are many not touched upon in connexion with South Africa which do not come properly within the scope of this Vote, and therefore we do not refer to them at all.

But the right hon. Gentleman has himself referred to one question, and has given some explanation which I think does deserve the attention of the House and as to which public opinion has gone a little astray, from what the right hon. Gentleman says. It is the question of the money which it was thought was being given in payment of requisition notes given by the burghers on commando. How does that matter stand? In the earliest document—namely, the letter from Lord Kitchener to the Secretary for War—what was said was this. There was nothing said in this part of it as to war losses:—

> "A judicial Commission will be appointed to which Government notes issued under the law of the South African Republic may be presented within six months. All such notes found duly issued under the terms of that law, and for which the persons presenting them have given valuable considerations, will be paid, but without interest. All the receipts given by the officers in the field of the late Republics, or under their orders, may likewise be presented to such Commission within six months, and, if found to be given *bonâ fide* for goods used by the burgher forces in the field, will be paid out to the persons to whom they were originally given. The sum in respect of Government notes and receipts shall not exceed £3,000,000 sterling, and, if the total amount of such notes and receipts approved by the Commission is more than that sum there shall be a *pro rata* diminution."

That was how the question stood in the draft arrangement forwarded by Lord Kitchener. The Government at home amended it, and the £3,000,000 was made applicable both to this question of the requisition notes and the repatriation:—

> "His Majesty's Government will place at the disposal of this Commission the sum of £3,000,000 for the above purpose, and will allow all notes and receipts given by officers in the field to be presented to a Judicial Commission which will be appointed by the Government, and if such notes and receipts are found to have been duly issued they will be received as evidence of war losses."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is just what I said.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: "As evidence of war losses." Then the third step in the development is this Vote which we are dealing with tonight, in which there is no mention of these notes. An impression largely entertained—and I am glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that it is not true—was that a large portion of these £3,000,000, which the people of this country desire should go to the relief of destitution and the restoration of the ordinary life of the burghers, had been absorbed in the payment of these requisition notes. I quite understand that anything received under these requisition notes should be taken as a deduction, as it were, from what should be allowed on the ground of destitution; but there was a danger, as many of those interested in it thought, that a large portion of this sum might be given to men comparatively well off in diminution of the sum available for the poorer people who have suffered from the war. If the right hon. Gentleman tells us, as I think he does, that that has not taken place, and will not take place, it will be a considerable relief to those who are anxious on this subject. Can the right hon. Gentleman inform us how far the process of paying for requisition notes given by our own forces has been completed? The right hon. Gentleman was asked about this in the earlier portion of the Session, but said it was a slow process and he could not then give the information, but that by-and-bye it would be given. I should be glad to know how far the process has been advanced, for these requisition arrangements for our forces are as much a debt as anything else we owe. [Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Hear, hear.] We are bound to make good the word given by our officers. Our army has had the benefit of those commodities, and we are bound to make them good, and I should be glad to know how far that process has proceeded.

Another thing upon which a strong feeling exists—a feeling of curiosity, to say the least of it—is how this relief under the head of the £3,000,000 is to be apportioned. What are the tests? What are the criteria? How are the recipients chosen where the recipients are more numerous than the money would suffice for? On what principle is the distribution made? Can the right hon. Gentleman say that? What we have to do here is to remove all chance—all suspicion—of ill-feeling. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said some wise and patriotic words last night, when he observed that in all these matters we have not only to do what we ourselves know to be right and just, but we ought to remove anything that might give rise to a taint of suspicion in the minds of those whom we all desire to conciliate. If the right hon. Gentleman would tell us about that it would be very useful. Some words have been written on this subject, which, I think, I am justified in referring to, because they startled the public considerably. A letter of Lord Milner's addressed to the Lord Mayor appeared in the papers the other day, in which he said:—

"It is too early to make an accurate estimate of the extent to which the amount granted by Government will meet the claims put in for compensation and assistance. But his Excellency considers that he may safely say that British subjects will receive at least 50 per cent. on the total assessment of their claims—'are those claims on the ground of requisition acknowledgements or on account of distress'—whereas it is improbable that the burghers will recover in anything like the same proportion the losses sustained by them."

On what ground is that difference maintained? I wish to meet the case of both with full generosity and justice. There is no question that the British who have suffered losses have just as great a claim, and in one sense have a greater claim, upon us than those who have been our adversaries, but the only line you can take with safety, and from which you cannot depart, is to do equal justice to both, and if this proposal means that there is to be a great gulf fixed between them, and that the one class are to be treated——[HON. MEMBERS: Oh!] Well, what does he say? He says that 50 per cent. at least of all British subjects will receive, and it is improbable that the burghers will receive anything like the same proportion. [An HON. MEMBER: And quite right, too.] That is a most regrettable position to take up. The cardinal virtue of the whole matter, and the direct and only way to remove these suspicions and jealousies and antipathies, is to do equal justice all round—full and equal justice all round. The right hon. Gentleman, as I began by saying, ended in a most optimistic tone, and I have expressed the wish, which I am sure is shared on this side of the House, notwithstanding our little disagreements sometimes, as even this evening, that his expectations may be fulfilled. He goes out to South Africa with tremendous responsibilities, as he doubtless is aware, but there is nobody, even among those who are most opposed to his policy, who does not wish him the most complete success.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I only rise to answer the questions which have been addressed to me. The payment of notes and requisitions issued by the War Office is, of course, a War Office matter. That is a sacred obligation which, of course, must be observed to the last penny. Although I am speaking for another Department, I believe the War Office are making every exertion to close the accounts and pay those requisitions as quickly as possible. At anyrate, the liability is fully admitted, and they will be paid at the earliest possible moment. The right hon. Gentleman has correctly interpreted the view of the Government as to the use to which the £3,000,000 will be put. It is distinctly stated in the article that the money is to be applied in order to, provide what is essential to enable the burghers to reconstitute their position.

SIR H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN: Will there be no payment for the notes?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: As to the notes, in my view there should be no payment for the notes as such. They are collateral evidence in aid of any claims, but the real distribution of the money will be guided rather by the necessities of the claimants than by any question of the notes. In regard to the last point, as the right hon. Gentleman said the issue is a broad one. I have said before in this House that it was the desire and intention of the Government at the end of the war to make it clear that it was not a disadvantageous thing, even if it was not an advantageous thing, to support the British flag, and, therefore, that any distinction that was to be made must be made in favour of the British. I use the word as including all loyalist persons, all persons who have assisted the Government. We are going to do a great deal for those who were recently our opponents, but I sincerely hope, as long as I have anything to do with the matter, to do more for those who have been with us.

(11.20.) MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said he wished to put a question to the Colonial Secretary with reference to the notes given by the Transvaal Government. He quite acknowledged that after the proclamation of the annexation of the Transvaal by Lord Roberts, this country was entitled to disregard any notes or acknowledgments given by the Boer generals or the Boer Government; but he would ask the Colonial Secretary whether he would not recognise it as an international obligation to acknowledge all the notes up to the date of the annexation, which the Transvaal Government, had it been permitted to continue, would have been bound to honour. He submitted that that was a proposition in international law which was incontrovertible. He did not suggest that every document produced by every burgher which claimed to be an acknowledgment of debt owed to him by the Transvaal Government should be paid. Of course, the genuineness of the documents should be inquired into, and if they did not represent full consideration, he did not suggest that they should be paid; but he submitted that it was not only an obligation of honour, but also an obligation of international law, that they should recognise to the full every obligation for valuable consideration or value received given by the Transvaal Government to its own subjects up to the time of the annexation. The right hon. Gentleman conceded that the compensation which would be given by this country would be based on considerations of humanity and policy. He submitted that there was a stronger consideration than either, and that was international obligation and justice. Our obligations to the Transvaal were greater than the right hon. Gentleman was willing to admit, because the British troops had destroyed property which they were bound not to destroy. That was, he submitted, incontrovertible. According to The Hague Convention we were bound under Article 46 to respect private property. Therefore, if private property were seized and destroyed, full compensation should be paid for it. Otherwise we would be disavowing the obligations of The Hague Convention. Again, Article 47 said that pillage was prohibited. If pillage was prohibited, we were bound to make good all the cost of the pillage committed by the British troops. That pillage was carried on to a great extent was not disputed. Lord Kitchener issued a proclamation in which he severely censured the British troops because they had too much transport with them, and he mentioned such things as pianos and kitchen ranges. But the *Globe* newspaper afterwards said that these articles had not been taken by the troops from home, but were loot taken from the farmhouses. That was an admission that the farms were looted. In addition, it was absolutely indisputable that practically the entire country had been devastated for military reasons. He was not arguing whether that was justifiable or not; all he said was that, inasmuch as it was contrary to The Hague Convention, we were in duty bound to pay compensation for the property destroyed, not merely as a matter of policy or humanity, but as a matter of international obligation. It was said that the terms of peace were unprecedentedly generous by those who so conveniently ignored the trifling fact that they had annexed these countries. The way to judge whether the terms were generous or not, would be to apply them to ourselves. Suppose this country had, by some misfortune, been conquered, would the terms be regarded as generous under which the country was annexed by, for instance, Germany, and was after annexation given a small trifling sum to compensate individual inhabitants for losses sustained at the hands of the German troops? The fact that we had annexed the two Republics altered the situation completely; but having annexed them it was absurd to say that three millions sterling in discharge of all our obligations was anything like generosity. So far from the terms being generous, they were the most severe that had ever been imposed by any foreign Power. The Boers would have preferred to continue their nationality, as Englishmen would, even if they had to pay a double indemnity. In 1870, the French paid the Germans an enormous indemnity, but they retained their country and our nationality, which was of greater importance to them than treble the amount of the indemnity. Having seized the Transvaal, the least we might do was to reimburse every farthing of damage which had been committed by the troops. The

Colonial Secretary suggested that some people imagined that the Boers, having gone to war, and having been defeated in war, ought to be placed in the same position as before the war. No one, as far as he knew, suggested anything of the kind. He fully recognised that war entailed inevitable hardships and losses which could never be compensated for, such as indirect losses resulting from the destruction of trade; but every direct loss should be compensated for under international law and The Hague Convention. To fail to do that, was to recede from the obligations of war and of honour. He was glad that the Colonial Secretary recognised that not only motives of humanity, but also motives of policy should be considered. If we were to govern the Transvaal with anything like success, we ought to compensate the Boers for every farthing's worth of property which was seized, and even then the Boers would have to sustain an almost incalculable loss, which could not be compensated for. He was glad that the Colonial Secretary had not shut the door completely, and that if the money was not sufficient a further loan would be issued. He did not care whether it came out of Imperial funds or from the Transvaal. The important question was, not where it came from but where it went to. It ought to be spent in compensating every one of the Boers whose property was destroyed. With regard to the British subjects who had lost property, he fully recognised that they too ought to be compensated, at all events, for property destroyed, whether by the Boer forces or by the British troops. But compensation for indirect losses was a different question altogether. He did not think, however, that they on that side of the House would complain very much even if that compensation were provided, if it were given all round.

Resolution agreed to; to be reported Tomorrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, the sum of £8,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom. (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolution to be reported tomorrow.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [LORDS].

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [21st October], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said that, since the Bill was before the House, he had been inquiring as to feeling in regard to it; and he thought that there was a pretty general concensus of opinion in favour of the Bill as a measure to meet an emergency. According to the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, the Appeal Court in England was constituted in two divisions with three judges each. Under the Act it was necessary that three judges should sit in the case of a final judgment, but that two judges could hear interlocutory motions, and although the Supreme Court could draw on *ex* *officio* judges, it was not intended that they should be brought in except in cases of emergency. With reference to the object of the present Bill, he understood that the Workmen's Compensation Act had caused a considerable block in the Court of Appeal. When the Act was passing through the House they were told that its object was to prevent litigation; but, in the result, it had produced very considerable litigation and a considerable block in the Court of Appeal. The object of the Bill was to enable that Court to sit in three divisions, instead of in two. If the Court sat in three divisions, it would necessarily be, to a certain extent, weaker than it was at present. But he gathered that there was no intention, so far as the present Bill was concerned, to interfere with there being three judges sitting in all cases of final judgment in the Court of Appeal. The difficulty that suggested itself to him was that they often found, when Bills were brought in to meet an emergency, that the Act was taken advantage of to apply it to a great many other cases, for which it was not specially intended. The present Bill was promoted by the Lord Chancellor, and he, of all judges, would be the judge who would have to sit almost continuously, as long as there were three divisions sitting at the one time. Some time ago a Bill was introduced for the purpose of reducing the number of judges who were to sit on final judgments from three to two; but it did not pass. If they could get an assurance to the effect that the present Bill was merely to meet an emergency, and that there was no ulterior object in view, he would not oppose the Second Reading. He might mention that the reason he objected at the first stage to the Bill, was that it was introduced without any explanation, and he thought that in a Bill of this kind, the legal profession should be consulted before the Bill went through the House.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said there was really nothing to be added to what had been said by the hon. Member. The whole effect of the Bill would be to enable the Court of Appeal to sit in three divisions, whereas at present it was confined to sitting in two divisions. The Bill did not contain a word which would enable any one of these three Courts to consist of less than three judges. On the contrary the part of the section requiring three judges to sit was left untouched.

Question put, and agreed to

Bill read a second time, and committed for Tomorrow.

BANKERS (IRELAND) ACT REPEAL BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [4th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

MR. CALDWELL said it was always very awkward when the Government, without any explanation, tried, a few minutes before twelve o'clock, to rush a Bill through. Instead of helping forward the measure, such a proceeding very often retarded it There was no disposition on that side of the House to interfere with many really useful Bills. They permitted the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Bill to pass after midnight a few nights ago, although its progress could have been stopped by the usual methods. The present Bill was a very important Bill in this respect, that it proposed to repeal an Act passed in Ireland in 1759, relating to private bankers. Some of the sections of that Act applied to England also; and it seemed strange that they should repeal the Act without making any special provision as regarded England.

MR. TULLY asked how the Act affected Scotland?

MR. CALDWELL said that was not the question. He was speaking in the Imperial Parliament, and he had often seen Irish Members blocking Bills which referred to other parts of the United Kingdom. If the Chief Secretary were to explain the measure now, he would not have the right to reply.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member only wants information, I think the House would probably allow him to continue his speech after receiving it.

MR. WYNDHAM said that some of the provisions of the old Act, which was passed by the Irish Parliament in 1759, imposed disabilities on Irish bankers which did not attach to bankers in England. He put it to the House whether that old Act, which was now obsolete, ought not to be repealed. Its provisions were rusty, mouldy, and obsolete, and he now suggested that the House should repeal so much of that Act as had not been repealed in the course of 150 years, and remove from Irish bankers disabilities that did not attach to the banking confraternity in England.

MR. CALDWELL said he did not intend to talk the Bill out, but he thought a Bill of this kind should not be brought in without some explanation.

MR. WYNDHAM said he had given an explanation.

MR. CALDWELL said that the explanation had been given after he had been put to the trouble of looking up the old Act. He could controvert a great deal of what had been said by the Chief Secretary; but he merely wished to put it to the Chief Secretary that, as the Bill affected Ireland, and as the Irish Members were absent, it might very well be left over until their return.

MR. WYNDHAM said that there was no objection to the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL said that that did not coincide with his information. The Chief Secretary would admit that he did not interfere with Irish Bills; but he thought that, in the circumstances, the Bill might reasonably have been left over, and not rushed through. He would not oppose the Second Reading; but it would be more gracious on the part of the Government to allow the Bill to stand over until next week.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Wednesday next.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one Minute after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 6*th November*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter relating to the imprisonment of a Member:—

> "King's Bench Division,
> "Ireland,
> "November 5th, 1902.
>
> "SIR,—I beg to inform you that on the 14th October a warrant was issued forth of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, Ireland, signed by me, for the arrest of Mr. William H. K. Redmond, Member of Parliament, for not complying with an order of the King's Bench Division, made by me and dated the 24th September, whereby he was ordered to enter into his own recognisance and find sureties to be of good behaviour for a period named in the order, and in default to be imprisoned for six months, or until he should sooner comply with said order.
>
> "Mr. Redmond was arrested yesterday under this warrant.
>
> "I have the honour to be,
> "Your obedient servant,
> "GEORGE WRIGHT,
> "Justice of the King's Bench Division,
> "Ireland.
>
> "To the Right Honourable
> "W. C. GULLY, P.C.,
> "The Speaker of the House of Commons."

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petition from Luton, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Steppingley, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Luton; and Cornwall; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Hindley; Liverpool; and Southampton; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petition from Luton, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1859.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 1st November, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Professor of Agriculture in the Royal College of Science, Dublin, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 371 (St. Helena, Annual Report for 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return for the quarter ended 30th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1902-3 (SOUTH AFRICAN WAR).

Copy presented, of Statement showing approximately the revised amounts now required under the various Votes for Army Expenditure in view of the conclusion of peace in South Africa, as compared with the provision made in the Estimates submitted to Parliament, with explanations of the differences [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVANTS.

Return ordered, "showing the total number of persons in the established Civil Service of the State on the 31st day of March, 1902, distinguishing those in each department of the Civil Service and Revenue Departments respectively."—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

LONDON WATER AREA.

Return ordered, "of Statement showing the population and rateable (and assessable) values of the boroughs and urban districts to be represented on the Water Board; together with the same particulars relating to the boroughs, urban districts, and rural districts (or the parts thereof) within the Metropolitan Water Area which are either to be excluded from that Area or to be unrepresented on the Water Board; also the proportion which the population and the rateable value of each district bears to the total population, and the total rateable value respectively of the whole of the proposed Water Area." — (*Mr. Rea.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Trade Statistics.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Government will consider the advisability of publishing yearly a compendium of trade within the Empire; and a summary of the world's trade.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The annual statistical abstracts of the United Kingdom, the Colonies, India, and foreign countries give a great deal of information bearing on the subject of the world's trade and of trade within the Empire. I will, however, consider whether it is possible, having regard to the demands upon the staff of the Department, to do something further in the direction desired by the hon. Member.

Island of Lewis—Building Regulations.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate if he will state how many houses have been erected in the Island of Lewis, under the bye-laws as to the regulation of buildings which were made by the Lewis District Committee of the County Council of Ross and Cromarty, and approved by the Local Government Board in December, 1900.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that twenty-two houses have been erected under the bye-laws referred to by the hon. Member.

Edgeworthstown Postmaster.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster General if he would give the name, salary, and nationality of the sorting clerk and telegraphist appointed to the postmastership of Edgeworthstown, and the number of applications received from Irishmen.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have appointed Mr. W. H. Killinder, sorting clerk and telegraphist at Galway, to be postmaster of Edgeworthstown. His pay as sorting clerk and telegraphist is 38s. a week, and in addition he has a supervising allowance of 6s. a week. I know nothing of his nationality.

Newbridge Postmaster.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster General if the postmastership of Newbridge was advertised in the Post Office Circular in the ordinary way; if so, what was the date of the circular; and will he state the nature of the appointment held by the officer selected and his qualifications for a postmastership.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The vacancy was not advertised. The officer who was appointed to be postmaster was a lobby officer, who had also had long and varied experience in the Army post office in South Africa.

Dublin Sorting Office Staff.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster General if he will state when it is intended to fill the vacancies existing in the supervising clerks and assistant superintendents' class in the Dublin sorting office; whether selections will be made from members of the Dublin staff; and if a circular has been issued to surveyors inviting applications for the positions from provincial officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The question of filling the vacancies referred to is under consideration, and I hope that it will be settled very shortly. The claims of members of the Dublin staff to promotion will have the fullest consideration. No such circular as the hon. Member described has been issued.

Salisbury Post Office Officials.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): To ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the decision that the relatives of supervising officers are not to be appointed to the same offices, he will state why a sorting clerk and telegraphist at Liverpool has been transferred to the Salisbury Post Office, at which town his father holds the position of postmaster.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The officer in question has not been transferred to the Salisbury Post Office, nor is there any proposal to transfer him, but he has been allowed to exchange places for a period of four months with an officer employed at Salisbury.

Poor Law Village Communities.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can give the names of the unions in England and Wales which have established village communities, or grouped cottage homes, for Poor Law children; the number of children accommodated in each village community; and the inclusive cost per head per annum (both establishment and maintenance charges).

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The following statement gives the names of the unions in which the guardians have provided or are providing accommodation of the kind referred to, with the number of children accommodated in each case. I have no information which would enable me to state the average cost per child per annum.

Union.	Number of Children.
Aston	288
Birmingham	460
Bridgend and Cowbridge	72
Burnley	150
Chorlton	326
Christchurch	72
Croydon	72
Dewsbury	72
Elham	66
Gateshead	182
Greenwich	524
Hackney	446
Hunslet	74
Kettering	60
Kings Norton	219
Leicester	256
Liverpool	288
Luton	30
Medway	180
Merthyr Tydfil	32
Neath	84
Newcastle-on-Tyne	190
Pontypridd	130
Rochdale	112
St. Olaves	570
Salford	304
Sculcoates	118
Shoreditch	416
Stepney	218
Stoke-upon-Trent	144
Swansea	120
Thanet, Isle of	120
Wallingford	45
Warrington	200
West Derby	650
Wolverhampton	240
Woolwich	300
Worcester	66

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, seeing that under the present working of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, the last union employing an officer has to pay the whole of his superannuation allowance without recovering any portion from the union or unions by whom the officer has been previously employed, he will consider the propriety of the formation of a central fund for the receipt of all superannuation contributions and payment of all superannuation allowances, such fund being raised and worked on the principles of an insurance company.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) In answer to a similar Question a few weeks ago I stated that there would be many difficulties in adopting such a scheme as that suggested, and that I could not at present give any promise to propose legislation to give effect to it. I added, however, that the whole subject should receive my careful consideration.

Navy—Firing Matches.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will explain the meaning of the Admiralty Regulation No. 901, when the match is burning, it is always to be over water in tubs, and in charge of a responsible person, and say whether burning matches are still used in connection with any service pattern of gun now in use in the Royal Navy.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Though not now used in any service pattern of gun now in use in the Royal Navy, slow match is still supplied as part of the stores for use in manned and armed boats, for kindling fires, firing rockets, etc. The precautions laid down in the article quoted from the Admiralty Regulations are therefore still in force.

India—Gold Remittances, Currency Reserves, etc.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the amount of gold remitted from India since February this year, and to what purposes these remittances have been applied; the sums of gold now held in India in the Currency Reserves, the Government Treasuries, and the Gold Reserve Fund respectively; whether any of the latter is deposited with the Presidency Banks or otherwise utilised in aid of commerce; the number of rupees (including value of subsidiary coins) issued since the beginning of this year; the total amount of silver imported during the same period, how much of this has been on Government account, and whether this portion is subject to the 5 per cent. import duty; the present amount of the cash balances in India and England respectively; and what has been, since 1st March, the average weekly amount lent out from the Indian Office Treasury in aid of the money market here.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The amount of gold remitted by the Government of India to this country since February last is £500,000, which has been added to the balances held by the Secretary of State in Council. The amount of gold held by the Government of India on the 15th October was as follows: Currency Reserve, £5,748,000; Government Treasuries, £88,000; Gold Reserve Fund, £175,000; total, £6,011,000. I have no reason to believe that any of this gold is deposited with the Presidency banks. If it were so deposited it would, of course, be necessary to transfer from the banks to the Currency Reserve or the Treasuries an equivalent amount in rupees, a course which, in all probability, would hinder commerce rather than aid it; but for a considerable time, whenever the mercantile community has desired gold in exchange for rupees, the Government of India has made its own stock freely available. The total coinage of silver in India from 1st April till 31st August, 1902, was Rs.7,38,63,606 (£4,925,000). But this includes the coinage of British dollars for use in Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements, the rupees coined for Native States, and the subsidiary coinage for use in British India. The rupees coined for Native States amounted to about Rs.80,00,000; but I am not yet in possession of exact figures on this point. The imports of silver into India during the period just mentioned were as follows: On private account, Rs.5,04,47,857; on Government account, Rs.51,830. It is provided by law that no customs duty is leviable on goods belonging to the Government of India. The latest figures for the cash balances in India and England are as follows: In India on the 31st of August, Rs.16,93,00,000; in England on the 5th of November, £5,062,228. The average weekly amount of loan from the Home Treasury during the present financial year has been £5,100,000.

Army Officers—Pay as Interpreters.

MR. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether an officer gains any advantage, pecuniary or otherwise, by qualifying as interpreter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Under Article 614 of the Pay Warrant an officer gets a reward of £125 for qualifying as interpreter in Russian, Arabic, or Turkish, and £75 on passing a further test examination within the next five years. Under Article 267 of the Pay Warrant an allowance is granted for employment as interpreter in the field.

Officers' Liability for Barrack Furniture.

MR. HALSEY: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers have now to supply themselves with barrack furniture, or whether it is provided for them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The quarters of all unmarried regimental officers who join the Army on or after the 1st December, 1902, will be furnished at the public expense. Officers' messes at home will be furnished when necessary as soon as possible after this date. A rent will be charged at the rate of 2d. per day for field officers, and 1d. per day for other officers. All officers will pay a further 1d. a day where furniture is supplied to messes.

South African War—Ranking of Volunteer Officers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that several officers of the Militia have recently received Army rank for services with regular troops in the United Kingdom during the South African War, like consideration has been, or will be, extended to officers of Volunteers whose services were accepted under like conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) It has already been decided to grant temporary rank to Volunteer officers serving at home, and steps are being taken to carry this out.

War Office Works Department Committee.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Report of the Departmental Committee on the reorganisation of the Works Department of the War Office has yet been made; and, if so, can he say when he proposes to commence the work of reorganisation, if any is recommended.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Committee has reported, and the Report is being carefully considered.

South Africa—Government Loans to Boers.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether loans granted to the Boers in the Harrismith district of South Africa are partly in money and partly in kind; if so, will he state what value is placed respectively on oxen and mules thus supplied; are the animals submitted to examination by a veterinary surgeon prior to the transaction being completed, and is a warranty given that they are sound.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) Loans to Boers are made, as a rule, one-third in cash and two-thirds in kind, to ensure the re-stocking of the farms instead of money being applied to the payment of debts. The values placed on oxen and mules are the cost prices, so far as can be ascertained, without deductions for loss or cost of forage. The animals are not submitted for veterinary examination, but passed on to farmers in exactly the same condition as received from the military, all sick being excluded. No warranty is given by the military on receipt of the animals by the Colonial Government, nor by the Government on transfer to the farmers.

Education Bill—School Teachers and Membership of Municipal Bodies.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding) To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in the event of the Education Bill now before Parliament becoming law, school teachers will be precluded from becoming members of a County Council or members of the council of a county borough; and, if they are not precluded from the membership of these Councils, will they be allowed to serve on the new education authority.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Teachers in schools provided by the local education authority will be clearly disqualified from being members of the County Council, Borough Council, or Urban District Council, which is the local education authority. This is the effect, as regards County Councils and Borough Councils, of Section 12 (*a*) of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and Sections 2 and 75 of The Local Government Act, 1888; and, as regards Urban District Councils, of Section 46 (*d*) of the Local Government Act, 1894, which also applies to the London Borough Councils. It is clearly fair that teachers in schools not provided by the local education authority should be placed in the same position in this respect as teachers in schools provided by that authority.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Johannesburg Local Rates.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the consent of the Governor of the Transvaal has been given or refused to the ordinance of the Johannesburg Town Council, proposing to raise the local rates on an assessment of the land values of the town.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): So far as I am aware the levying of rates in Johannesburg is at present governed by the Administrator's Proclamation of the 13th June last, which I shall be glad to show to the hon. Member if he desires it and will call at the Colonial Office.

The Colonial Conference.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies why the speeches of the Colonial Premiers delivered at the conference which took place at the Colonial Office are not given in the Blue-book which has been issued; and whether it is proposed to issue supplementary Papers giving full details of the proceedings.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am obliged to the hon. Member for giving me an opportunity of contradicting some very extraordinary misstatements that appeared in a London daily paper. If he will refer to the first page of the Blue-book he will find the answer to his question. The fact is that the reason for not publishing a full report of the proceedings with the speeches of the Colonial Prime Ministers, was that objection was taken that it would be a breach of faith to publish what had been from the first treated as confidential. The Prime Ministers unanimously agreed that the speeches of the members of His Majesty's Government and certain Papers should be given. This has been done and no further Papers will be published.

Army Commissions.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will consider the advisability of granting special facilities for promotion to commissions of those who, when serving as Militia Officers at the time that the granting of commissions without examination ceased, resigned their commissions and enlisted in order to go on active service in South Africa, seeing that many of their brother officers who remained at home in the Militia obtained commissions before the close of the war without examination.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I am afraid that in view of the large number of supernumerary officers in the Army it will not be possible to grant any more direct commissions to any class of individuals.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman willing to grant some special facilities for these young men, who are very hardly treated?

MR. BRODRICK: What does the hon. Gentleman mean by special facilities?

CAPTAIN NORTON: A modified examination.

MR. BRODRICK: We cannot modify the examination. We can only give service marks.

Army Officers' Pay.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TUFNELL (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a Committee to inquire into the position, pay, and allowances of the combatant officers of the Army.

MR. BRODRICK: My hon. and gallant friend's suggestion would require to be supported by some reasons for instituting such an inquiry. No change has taken place in the position of officers in the Army of recent years, and the demand for commissions shows that it is impossible to satisfy the large number of candidates available. Efforts are being made, especially in the cavalry, to reduce officers' expenses, but I fear I cannot hold out any hope of a general reconsideration of the pay and pensions of officers.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TUFNELL: The Army pay of subaltern officers has been the same for the last hundred years, and is quite inadequate to the position they are expected to maintain.

Training of Recruits—Barrack Accommodation at Omagh.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the Government to abolish the system of transferring the details of regiments from the depots of the territorial regiment to outlying barracks; whether this arrangement has been condemned by the military authorities; and whether he will consider the advisability of purchasing the disused gaol at Omagh, which could be used as barracks, and obviate the necessity of sending the details to Enniskillen.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of sending more troops to Enniskillen, seeing that three of the finest regiments were raised there?

MR. BRODRICK: The arrangement to which the hon. Member alludes has not been condemned. It is in accordance with the principles of military administration to send recruits away from their depôts as soon as their physical training is complete, in order that their field training may be taken up. There is no intention of increasing the barrack accommodation at Omagh.

Army Re-enlistments—Age Regulations.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the limit of age for re-enlistment of time-expired men.

MR. BRODRICK: The limit of age is thirty years for ordinary Army re-enlistments, and forty years for the Royal Garrison regiment. There is no limit of age for the reservists rejoining the Colours under Special Army Order of 22nd September last.

Employment of Reservists in Civilian Duties.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that 80 per 1,000 of an average battalion are employed on civilian duties, he will consider the advisability of trying the experiment tried in the Garrison Artillery of thus employing reservists in the Line.

MR. BRODRICK: Efforts are being made to provide such relief as may be possible, but my hon. and gallant friend will recognise that any general change would cause immense expenditure.

Naval Gunnery—Practice Ammunition.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he is aware of any instances in the Navy of ammunition intended for practice firing being thrown overboard.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I have been unable to trace any instances of the practice referred to, at any rate in the last twenty years. If such instances have occurred they are unknown to the Admiralty, but if the hon. Member will call my attention to any specific case it will be investigated.

Boys and Able Seamen in the Channel Fleet.

MR. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the proportion of able seamen and boys in the Channel Fleet; and whether he will give the proportion of the two classes on board H.M.S. "Magnificent," and the number of ordinary seamen.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The following is the proportion of able seamen and boys in the Channel Fleet: Able seamen, 79; boys, 21. In H.M.S. "Magnificent" the two classes are in the proportion, of able seamen, 77; boys, 23. The number of ordinary seamen is 176, and if these were included in the calculation the proportion of seamen to boys in this ship would be 89½ to 10½, which s the same as the proportion of seamen to boys in the Channel Fleet as a whole.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any communication has been received from the Belgian Government with regard to the Brussels Sugar Convention since that instrument was completed; whether any of the signatory Powers have so far decided to, or declined to, ratify the Convention; and whether any proposals have been made to extend the time for ratification.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The Belgian Government have communicated to us the announcement that the ratification of His Majesty the King of the Belgians has been deposited. No Power has declined to ratify, and we have no reason for anticipating that any of the Powers who signed will refuse to do so. The reply to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

MR. LOUGH: Has any change been made in the date of the ratification?

LORD CRANBORNE: Not that I am aware of.

Ontario Bounties on Beet Sugar Exports.

Mr. LOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state the rate of the bounty paid by the Province of Ontario on the export of beet sugar; whether any of such sugar comes into the United Kingdom; and whether it is proposed to take any action in the matter in connection with the Brussels Sugar Convention.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): No bounty is given by Ontario on the export of beet sugar. By an Act of 1901 a sum of £47,000 was set aside for the temporary payment of a bounty of ½ cent. per lb. on refined beet sugar produced during the first two years of a factory's operations, and of ¼ cent. per lb. on the product of the third year. The exports from Ontario are not separately stated, but no considerable quantity of sugar that benefited by the bounty can have come to the United Kingdom, since the total export of Canadian sugar (other than maple) to this country during 1901–2 was only sixty tons. Under the Brussels Sugar Convention it would be the duty of the Permanent Commission to examine and report to the Powers as to the existence of bounties in various countries. In no event, however, would His Majesty's Government be required to penalise the sugar of a British Colony.

Macedonian Reforms.

Mr. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of the Foreign Office has been called to the statement made by Dr. Daneff, the Bulgarian Prime Minister, a few days ago, to the effect that all the Powers, with only one exception, were willing to demand the introduction of reforms into Macedonia, and were engaged in discussing the best means of intervention at the Porte; whether he has any information respecting this statement; and can he state which of the Powers are taking part in the negotiation.

Lord CRANBORNE: I have seen the statement in the newspapers. His Majesty's Government have not received any report on the subject, and they have no information bearing out the statement mentioned.

Losses through Foot and Mouth Disease.

Mr. ARCHDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can state the estimated amount of loss to British and Irish farmers by the last outbreak of foot and mouth disease due to importation of cattle from abroad, and the decrease in numbers in consequence of that outbreak.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of AGRICULTURE (Mr. Hanbury, Preston): I understand my hon. friend to refer to the epidemic of foot and mouth disease in Great Britain which lasted from 1880 to 1884, when it was practically stamped out. During that period some 336,000 cattle, 370,000 sheep, and 37,000 swine were reported as having been attacked with the disease, and it was estimated that the direct loss caused to stockowners could not have been less than £2,500,000.

Transfer of Government Departmental Powers to County Councils.

Mr. PYM (Bedford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state whether, under the Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill, powers of Government Departments could be transferred to a County Council in opposition to the views of the Departments or of the local authorities concerned.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): Under Section 10 of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Local Government Board can make Provisional Orders for transferring to the Councils of counties and county boroughs certain powers and duties of Departments of the Government and other bodies. This, however, can at present only be done generally. The object of the Bill is to enable the transfer to be made as respects the Council of a particular county or borough where the circumstances may render this desirable, without its being necessary to deal with the Councils of all the counties and county boroughs. The consent of the Government Departments or other bodies whose powers were proposed to be transferred would still be required, and the Order would not take effect until it was confirmed by Parliament. Under the Bill particular cases could be met where there is no objection to the transfer on the part of the borough or other district Councils who would be affected. In the event of there being substantial opposition on the part of those Councils to the proposal, I should not contemplate making a transfer.

Post Office and the Irish Language.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the complaints from Dr. Henry, of the Gaelic Association, London, as to the non-delivery for six or seven days, in the county of Sligo, of letters and postcards addressed in Irish, he will consider the advisability of insisting on persons obtaining Post Office appointments in Ireland having some knowledge of the Irish language.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): In my opinion there is no sufficient reason for requiring a knowledge of the Irish language from entrants into the Post Office service in Ireland.

MR. TULLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Irish language movement is a great and growing one, and not to be trifled with?

[No answer was returned.]

Lurgan Post Office.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the postal and telegraphic business in Lurgan is carried on in temporary premises which are in a condition dangerous to health; and what steps have been taken to proceed with the erection of the new post office buildings on the site purchased two years ago.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There is no reason to suppose that the temporary Post Office at Lurgan is in a condition dangerous to health; on the contrary the health of the staff is stated to have improved considerably since the office was occupied. It is expected that the new building on the site which was acquired in August, 1 01, will be begun next year, if the Board of Public Works obtain the necessary funds from Parliament.

MR. TULLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these temporary premises are simply a hoarding used for pasting up Crimes Act Proclamations?

[No answer was returned.]

Compensation for Malicious Damage.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at Sligo Quarter Sessions on 30th October last Mr. Robert Sproule was granted a decree for £6 for damage done to a mare, his property; and that it appeared from the evidence that the plaintiff could not get anyone to work for him because he was a Protestant and refused to join the United Irish League; and will he state what steps, if any, the Government intend taking in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Compensation was awarded, as stated, to Mr. Sproule, whose evidence was to the effect mentioned. The County Council has appealed, I understand, against the decision of the County Court judge, and I am precluded, therefore, from discussing the case.

Ballaghaderreen Publican's Licence.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Mr. James Casey, Ballaghaderreen, who was refused a transfer of a publican's licence at the last Boyle Quarter Sessions; and whether, in view of the recommendation of the County Court Judge to the Lord Lieutenant to exercise his dispensing powers in this case, he can state what action will be taken in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: No representations have been made to the Lord Lieutenant in this matter. If a recommendation of the character suggested were made, it would receive the attention due to the source from which it came. But I ought to observe that the number of public houses in this locality is already very large.

Irish Local Government Contracts.

MR. ARCHDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 19th July last the Longford Board of Guardians, on the Motion of the Chairman, decided to take no contracts except from members of the United Irish League, and that a similar motion was agreed to at the last meeting of the Sligo Rural District Council; and will he say what action he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. ARCHDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the action of Mayo County Council in giving the printing contract to Mr. Walshe, Ballina, at £140 5s., though Mr. Thomas Chapman, Athlone, tendered at £85; and will he say what action they propose to take.

MR. ARCHDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the meeting of the Granard Board of Guardians, held to consider the half-yearly contracts, the secretary of the United Irish League Branch was in attendance with his list of members, and the names of those tendering were read out, and the preference in the contracts was given to those who appeared on the United Irish League list; and will he say whether he proposes to take action in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: My attention has been called to the several matters mentioned in these Questions. I can best reply by saying that proceedings will be instituted by the Crown against all local bodies who, in breach of the public trust they are elected to discharge, endeavour to promote the pecuniary interests of any political society, or of the members of such a society. This being so, my hon. friend will, I think, agree with me that it is unnecessary to discuss the separate instances brought to my notice of a breach of the public trust.

Irish Dispensary Medical Service.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of the president at the annual meeting of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, to the effect that the entire Irish dispensary medical service stood in need of reform; and whether it is the intention of the Government to promote legislation in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have seen a newspaper report of the remarks of the President of the Royal College of Surgeons on the occasion referred to. The matters discussed by the President are not such as can properly be dealt with by means of a reply to a Question.

Congested Districts Board—Sale of Lord Dillon's Mansion.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Congested Districts Board have advertised for sale the former mansion of Lord Dillon at Loughglynn; and why have the private offers been declined which were made to turn this residence into a local technical and agricultural college.

MR. WYNDHAM: The premises have been advertised for sale in pursuance of the Board's desire to obtain as large a price as possible for them. The Board has expressed its readiness to entertain favourably any proposal for applying the premises to a useful public purpose. But no definite proposal of that nature has so far been received, and no private offers have been declined.

*MR. TULLY: Why was the Roscommon offer refused?

MR. WYNDHAM: No definite proposal has been made, and it has not been refused therefore.

*MR. TULLY: If they apply for it will they get it?

[No answer was returned.]

Calderwood v. M'Curdy.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Calderwood v.

M'Curdy, heard at the Lifford Quarter Sessions, County Donegal, on 30th October last; and whether, in view of the police evidence on the occasion, it is proposed to take any action under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act to secure the ends of justice in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: Calderwood sued M'Curdy for £5 damages and assault on the ground that his hat had been forcibly taken from him. The judge gave a decree for £1 and indicated that, in his opinion, the matter might well have been settled out of Court.

*MR. TULLY: Did not the prosecuting counsel state that the Crimes Act should be applied to this case?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

Irish Poor Law Superannuation.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the unanimous resolution of the Irish Poor Law Association in favour of a Superannuation Bill on the basis of the liability of the ratepayers being limited to a national rate of a farthing in the pound; and whether he is prepared to afford facilities for the passing into law of a measure framed on these lines.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. But I do not propose to introduce any fresh legislation during this Session.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

* (2.30.) THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University), in moving the Amendment standing in his name, said he did not desire to add much to the statement he made on the previous day as to the purport of this Amendment, but he would remind the Committee that the object was to make it perfectly clear that the Municipal or County Council was the local education authority; that the Education Committee was a consultative committee; that the local education authority was bound to consult the committee, but was not bound to take its advice, or even to wait for that advice, if the advice were delayed or not forthcoming; and that to meet the convenience of the educational work in an area the County Council had nearly unlimited power of delegating its duties to that committee, except in one very important respect, viz., the raising a rate or borrowing money. His hon. friend the Member for East Somerset proposed to strike out the words which would require the local education authority, before exercising its powers, to consider the report, if any, of its education committee. He thought it would, for general reasons, be undesirable to omit these words. He took it that his hon. friend was principally moved by fear lest there should be any unnecessary delay in carrying out the educational work of the area. For his own part he thought the words "if any" guarded the local education authority against that contingency; and when matters were urgent the local education authority might proceed without the report of its committee. The powers of delegation which the Government proposed to give were very considerable, and, although at the outset of the scheme there might be difficulties and delays, yet the local education authority and its committee would soon learn what amount of delegation was necessary for the proper administration of an area. But there were two more important considerations than these. The Education Committee was simply a consultative committee. Every matter was to stand referred to it, but the local education authority was not bound to take its advice. It was important that the local education authority should have placed at its disposal the services of the persons best fitted to advise it in the area with which it dealt. Was it desirable then to strike out words which brought home to the Council that it should, except in urgent cases, consider the report of the Education

Committee? He had no doubt in his own mind that the County and Borough Councils would be very desirous of getting the best advice and of consulting their committees on all the points on which they were bound to consult them, and would, as a rule, be desirous of taking that advice, even at the cost of some delay in waiting for it. He had no doubt, also, that there would be found throughout the area persons capable of giving advice, who would, although they were employed in a merely consultative capacity, be willing to give their services in that respect. He could not help fearing that if it were distinctly set down in the Bill that the local education authority was under no obligation even to consider the report of its committee, it would be a distinct discouragement to the sort of people we wanted on these Education Committees. One other consideration he would press upon the Committee. The omission which his hon. friend proposed carried with it the suggestion that the Education Committee had executive powers, that everything was to stand referred to them; and nothing was said about the Council exercising its power with or without the report of the committee. The Amendment, he thought, would be subject to the charge of ambiguity on a point which he had been particular to clear up the day before—namely, that the executive in educational matters was the local education authority and not the Education Committee. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words '(2) All matters relating to the exercise by the Council of their powers under this Act shall stand referred to the Education Committee, and the Council, before exercising such powers, shall consider the report (if any) of the Education Committee with respect to the matter in question. The Council may also delegate to the Education Committee, with or without any restrictions or conditions, as they think fit, any of their powers under this Act, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) did not hesitate to say that the Amendment, which almost amounted to a new Clause, would be welcomed on that side of the House. He had placed on the Paper Amendments identical in form almost, and certainly identical in substance, When the Bill was first considered, hon. Members on that side were alarmed at what appeared to them to be the too large measure of independence given to the Education Committees, and there was a general wish on that side of the House to modify that provision. There were three models which might have been followed in regard to the relations of a body like a County Council, or the Council of a large borough, with regard to a committee. There was the ordinary committee of a County or Borough Council, which had no executive authority, but was simply advisory—a body which could not act on its own initiative but had to refer everything it did to the parent body for confirmation and action; next, there were statutory committees such as the Watch Committees, which were practically independent in regard to police, and the Asylum Committees, which represented various Councils and Boroughs, and enjoyed an exceedingly large independence. There were also Joint Committees controlling the county police. The last of these examples seemed to have inspired the promoters of the Bill. In addition, however, there was another class of committees, and hon. Members on that side of the House wondered why the Government had not taken them as models, since they existed chiefly in regard to educational matters. Accordingly, the Amendment which he placed on the Paper was practically a revival of the words of the Technical Instruction Act, and he was glad to say that on that principle there seemed now to be something like agreement. They had now had ten or eleven years' experience of the working of that Act, and the most satisfactory result had accrued. They were indebted to the Government for having met the views of the House, and of a large body of the public opinion outside, which desired, while giving full latitude to committees to deal with small matters, that in regard to greater questions, such as the fixing of rates, the borrowing of money and capital expenditure on the schools, they should follow the precedent of the Technical Instruction Act.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked the Government if there was any objection to the insertion of the words "except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money" after the word "Act." If the committee was not to have the power of raising money it should be clearly stated in the Clause. Personally, he had always been greatly in favour of the County Council being made the local authority, because he hoped it would tend to economy, but he was not quite sure about the committees to be appointed under this Bill.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment as amended—

"After the word 'Act' to insert the words 'except power of raising a rate or borrowing money.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he had no objection to the Amendment. It was quite clear that the education authority ought to be consulted as to the amount of money that was required to carry out the schemes to which the education authority was asked to agree. No doubt the question of raising a rate or borrowing money was a matter which did not concern the committee at all.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) asked for a legal definition of the words "stand referred" in the Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education. It appeared to him the obvious meaning was that the local education authority would have no power to act in any matter at all until that matter had been referred to and dealt with by the Education Committee. If that were so, then he thought the additional Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford was necessary.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said the intention was that before action was taken on any matter, opportunity must be given to the local committee to report on it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): That means that under no circumstances can the local education authority take independent action.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is just what it does not mean.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I certainly understood the Attorney General to say that their action was to be dependent on having a report from the committee. They are not to act without first sending the matter to the committee.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said they were bound to send the matter to the Education Committee, which could report if it chose, but the local education authority's action in the absence of a report would be quite untrammelled.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Is it a condition precedent to the action of the education authority that they should send it to the committee? Can they act without sending it to the committee?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The effect of the word is that *ipso facto* the matter shall be referred to the Education Committee in practice, with or without their report the local education authority can take such action as it may think fit.

*SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said that under the Clause there were two functions—one of reference, the other of delegation. As he understood it, the local education authority would be able to delegate certain powers and duties inherited under Clause 6 from School Boards and school attendance Committees to the committee, a delegation which would have, he presumed, to be approved by the Board of Education. Then there wonld be left certain other powers and duties which came under the head of "reference." The committee would be asked to report on these referred matters before the local education authority could take action. The Bill put the Reference before the Delegation. He thought it should be the other way about.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They need not necessarily report.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) took it that the first part of the Amendment gave the committee a "right of audience," such as had been granted in schemes to the headmasters of great schools, enabling them to attend and place their veiws before the governing bodies. Assuming that that was the correct interpretation of the Amendment, the local education authority would have the entire power of delegation, and if it did so delegate its duties the committee would be able to act immediately, possessing as it did, full authority from the superior body. Although the word "consultation" had been used in the debate, he thought the powers possessed by the committee would be more analogous to those enjoyed by Corporation committees which dealt with building, sanitary, and kindred matter. The Council or Corporation reserved to itself the power of conforming the action of the Council, and that, he took it, would be the case with the committee set up under this Clause.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said he was in favour of the principle of the Government Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford is now before the Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We are quite willing to accept that. We had better do so, and thus clear the way for the discussing of the Amendment of my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education.

(3.0.) SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE thought the words of the Amendment moved by his right hon. friend the Member for Sleaford were totally unnecessary. He desired to make two or three observations on the Amendment which was proposed by the Secretary to the Board of Education.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I think we had better dispose of the Amendment to the Amendment first.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) contended that the words of the right hon. Gentleman did not improve the proposal of the Government at all, because they were acts which could only be done by the Council and would not come under the reference as a matter of course.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that although the change was not a very great one it was in the right direction.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) said his right hon. friend was hardly correct in saying that the powers reserved to the County Council were broader than those contained in the Amendment. He understood that the object of the Government was to give a free hand to the local education authority in the raising of the rates and the borrowing of the money.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said if this committee was not to consider the raising of the rate and how much money was to be borrowed, what could it do? The result of putting in these words would be that this committee could not consider the rate to be levied to carry out its own policy, and its own recommendations would have to be referred to the Finance Committee. What harm could there be in a committee of this sort considering their own expenditure? Why should they not be allowed to consider it?

MR. M'KENNA contended that in the event of the committee not reporting, the local education authority would not be able to raise a rate to carry out the liability imposed upon them under Clause 6. He heartily agreed with the Amendment.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said that as the matter stood, except as to the raising of the rates and the borrowing of money, all the powers conferred upon the local education authority must be referred automatically to the Education Committee before any executive action could be taken by the County Council.

He did not see why this should be made obligatory. That the County Council, whether in the case of provided or non-provided schools, would take the opportunity of inquiring from the Education Committe what its advice would be was practically certain, but he could conceive cases in which the local authority would have to act with speed. Surely it would be better for the smooth working of the Act that it should not be compelled in all cases, except in financial matters, to refer to the Council but should exercise its own discretion. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'shall stand' in order to insert the words 'may be.'"—*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*

Question proposed, "That the words 'shall stand' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said this Amendment struck very deep at the object of the Bill. They desired to obtain for the local authority the best assistance the district could afford. If people who could give such assistance were willing to serve it was important that the advice of the Education Committee would come from a body which had the whole educational policy of the area before it. Everything ought to be referred to the Education Committee, and then they would be able to give such advice as the local education authority might very well follow.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that this question depended upon the constitution they were going to make of these advisory bodies. If, as a great many hon. Members desired, a large proportion of the Education Committee consisted of members of the council, then they would have the advantage of the knowledge and experience of those members. If they were going to give, as they ought to give on these advisory bodies, a majority which would consist of members of the Council, then they would have a voice in any decision which the Council might take. If they were really going to give to the Council power which the education authority ought to have, they ought not to exclude them from any independent action in the first instance which they thought fit to take. It was an unnecessary derogation from their authority to say they should never act without referring this matter to the authority. Therefore, why exclude them altogether except under circumstances in which the supreme education authority might think fit to take the matter into its own hands. One could conceive local circumstances which would make it highly desirable that the education authority, in some instances, should keep its power to deal with these matters on its own initiation.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said his objection was not so much to the word "shall" but to "stand." Suppose, for instance, that there was a complaint of the violation of the Conscience Clause in a certain school. That complaint would have to be forwarded to the Education Committee, and they might smother it if they desired and not report it to the Council at all. The Council, having no report, would have no knowledge of the question which had been raised, and it would take away from the Council the power of hearing an appeal on some question that had been raised. He did not wish action to be taken without reference to the committee unless it had failed to deal with some matter. His objection was not to the word "shall," but to the word "stand." He suggested that it might be altered to "shall be referred," for that would enable the Council to send the appeal with an instruction to deal with it. In this House they sometimes gave an instruction to a Committee, but by the wording put forward by the Government he took it that action of that kind would be impossible if the word "stand" remained in the Clause. It would then be within the official knowledge of the Council, before being referred to the Committee, so that if the committee failed to do their duty in reporting on the matter, the Council would be able to take action to remedy the neglect of the committee.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) said there was no doubt that in the vast majority of cases the County Council would consult the Education Committee, but there might be cases where the County Council would desire to act at once without a reference of that kind. Otherwise a matter which must be disposed of in a few minutes would have to come before the County Council at one of its quarterly meetings. By the Amendment as it now stood it would be referred to the Education Committee, and probably, owing to the technicalities, it would not come before the County Council until a meeting three months after that. As a matter of fact there might be instances in which it would be highly desirable that the County Council should act at once. He hoped the Government would accept the Amendment that "shall stand" should be altered to "may be."

Sir JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) asked the Attorney General whether the words as they stood might have the effect of excluding from the knowledge of the council any matter referred to the Education Committee.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: It must come before the County Council.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER said he understood that nothing could come before the Council except upon a report from the committee. The ordinary course in the conduct of the proceedings of public bodies was that a matter should in the first instance come before the council. What would be the effect in the first instance of these words?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the matter would be communicated to the clerk of the council and he would be bound to send it to the Education Committee. The committee might report, and if they reported, of course, that report would be considered, but if they did not report at all the local education authority might act entirely for themselves. [An Hon. Member "No."] The words were "and the council, before exercising any such powers, shall consider the report (if any) of the Education Committee with respect to the matter in question." [An Hon. Member "They are not bound to report."] The committee might not report, but he apprehended that they always would report. The Government had provided for the possibility of the Education Committee delaying action. If after a reasonable time there was no report, the County Council would take the matter into their own hands and deal with it.

Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the explanation given on behalf of the Government was better than the statement in the Bill. There was nothing in the Amendment that would indicate that the lapse of time made any difference at all. All it said was that the Council "shall consider the report (if any)." What was a reasonable time? If the council had absolute power why should not that be stated here? One thing was clear from the statement of the Attorney General, and that was that the Council had no initiative in the matter, Suppose a letter came with regard to the Conscience Clause, or it might be with regard to the affairs of a voluntary school, it would be sent by the clerk of the council to the committee. It would stand referred to the committee without any action on the part of the Council. He did not think that should be the case at all. He asked the Prime Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary to state whether the council would have the power of giving an instruction to this committee with regard to the carrying out of their functions. According to the Amendment the report of the committee was a condition precedent on any action on the part of the council, and according to the Attorney General they could only act either after a report had been received, or after a reasonable time had elapsed without the committee reporting. How could they give an instruction if that was the case?

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: They delegate.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said they could only act in the two contingencies stated by the Attorney General, and if that was the case they could not give an instruction to the committee at all.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said the matter might be referred to the Education Committee with an instruction accompanying the delegating power to act for the Council.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it did not come before the council at all. That was exactly the difference between his hon. friend's Amendment and that of the hon. Baronet. The hon. Baronet's Amendment said—

> "All matters relating to the exercise by the Council of their powers under this Act shall stand referred to the Education Committee, and the Council, before exercising any such powers, shall consider the report (if any) of the Education Committee with respect to the matter in question."

If a letter were addressed to the Clerk of the County Council with regard to an infringement of the Conscience Clause it would "stand referred" to the Education Committee, and thereafter it could only come before the Council in the two ways indicated by the Attorney General, assuming the hon. and learned Gentleman's interpretation to be correct, but that was a matter on which he respectfully differed from him. If the intention of the Government was that it should come before the Council they ought to alter these words, because by the Amendment as it stood they were simply courting delay. By referring a matter first to the Education Committee, then to the County Council, and afterwards on appeal to the Board of Education, a period of twelve months might elapse before a final decision could be obtained.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucester, Tewkesbury) said the hon. Member's Amendment would do exactly the opposite of what he desired to have done, namely, to expedite matters.

MR. WHITLEY said that what he proposed was "shall be" instead of "shall stand."

SIR JOHN DORINGTON said the Amendment before the Committee was to insert the words "may be." By adopting these words they would get into the very difficulty with regard to delay which they wished to avoid. He supported the view that the words of the Clause should be "shall stand" and not "may be."

MR. WHITLEY asked whether the Government would be prepared to accept the word "be" instead of "stand."

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is making two bites at the cherry.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he wished leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, as amended—

> "to leave out the word 'stand,' and insert the word 'be.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'stand' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*(3.30.) SIR JOHN BRUNNER said that if the words "shall be" were in the Bill he understood that all matters would be referred by the Council to the committee, who would then proceed to take action. If the Attorney General were to say that the alteration of "stand" to "be" would have that effect, he would be satisfied.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that if "stand" was used, the reference was dogmatic, but if "be" was used it only imposed another step.

*SIR JOHN BRUNNER said it was quite a common thing for a local authority to instruct their clerk to refer a matter sent to him to a committee.

MR. BRYCE said that the difficulty of his hon. friend the Member for the Northwich Division evidently was that the County Council might not know the matter that was referred to—that the machinery of the Amendment would be much too automatic. Was there anything in the words of the Amendment which would prevent a general instruction being given to the clerk?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought it was clear that the Council might order their clerk to inform them at their next meeting of all that had been done.

MR. BRYCE: Would they discuss it?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Certainly.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said that for the first time in the history of local government and legislation upon it by this House, it was proposed to say that the local authority should not deal with any question of which it was the ultimate arbiter and judge, until a subordinate portion of the authority had first considered it. In no other branch of local Government dealt with by any of the great municipal corporations or County Councils of the country, or by any poor-law authorities of the country could they find laid down in any legislation that the major authority should not deal with any business until a subordinate portion of that authority had first dealt with it. That was the principle of the proposal made by the Government.

*The CHAIRMAN: The Amendment now is that the word "stand" shall be left out in order to insert "be."

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said that the question was whether the word "stand" should be allowed to form part of the original Amendment. The effect of allowing the word "stand" to remain would be that all matters before being considered by the local authority should be first considered by the Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not wish to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but it seemed to him that the hon. Gentleman's argument, whatever its value might be, would be equally applicable to the original Clause and the Clause as amended.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said he was afraid the right hon. Gentleman did not see the effect of the original or substituted words. The substituted words would make this difference, that it would cause the matter to come before the local authority, and the local authority could express its opinion upon it by way of instruction to the committee. He asked all those hon. Members in the House—and he saw a good many on both sides—who had great experience in local government, either in municipal corporations or County Councils, what they would think if on any other question of local Government, their County Councils or municipal corporations were debarred from considering a subject at their meetings until it had first been considered and reported on by a subordinate authority or a committee. He did not believe that it was worth the while of the right hon. Gentleman to insist on these words, because they all knew that the practice of the local authorities was to refer all matters to the particular committees which dealt with them. There was a provision in the Municipal Corporations Act that all questions to be considered by committees should first come before the Corporation. Surely they could trust such great local authorities as the Corporations of Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham, to say whether or not a committee should consider a particular matter first. But by this Clause the Government said "No, the corporation must not consider it until the committee has first done so."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said he hoped the Government would consider the appeal made by the hon. Member for Huddersfield, who was such a high authority on the subject of local government. He was sure that the object of the Government must be to conciliate those great local authorities. Why in the world should they not have the power of reference to these committees? It should be remembered what these committees would be. They would be largely aliens to the primary authority, because they were to consist, to a great degree, of outsiders, and why give a greater prerogative to a part than to the whole? Was that a wise thing to do? Did the Government think that that would induce those local bodies to look with more favour on the administration of this Bill? What the word "stand" excluded was the power of the local authority to direct the committee. Take the case of a complaint under the Conscience Clause. The local authority might think that that was a matter which should be speedily decided, but, as the Clause of the Government stood, the local authority could not send the matter to the committee with instruction to look immediately into the matter and report at once, and as the local authority only met once in three months the delay would be very serious. This question went to the root principle of the power of the local authorities in this country.

Mr. WHITLEY said he wished to point out the difference between the effect of the word "shall" and the word "be." The Attorney General would not deny the proposition that the word "stand" prevented the access of the ratepayers direct to the Council which they had elected. The representation of the ratepayers would automatically be referred to the committee and it would only come within the knowledge of the Council when it was reported on by the committee. What he wished to protect was the right of the ratepayers to have access to the men they had elected.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought the object of the hon. Member would be better carried out by the word "stand." The hon. Member aimed at two things—in the first place, that the education authority should be seized of what was going on; and, in the second place, that there should be no undue delay. Under the word "stand," the Education Authority would be seized of what was going on, and could of course, discuss what was going on. If the word "be" were substituted for "stand," that would be introducing another link in the general administrative chain, which could only lead to delay. Take the case of a matter, regarding which authority had been delegated to the committee. Under the word "stand," it would go before the Council and before the committee; the Council might not meet for two or three months, but meantime the committee would consider it. If the case were of a different character, and dealt in a matter not delegated, then it would go at once before the committee, and before the County Council as soon as it met. The Council would await the report of the committee before taking action, and, if that report were too long delayed, it would take action on its own account. What could be more simple, or more expeditious, or what could more amply secure both the administrative autonomy and power of the education authority, and, at the same time, the advisory position and dignity of the Education Committee? He hoped the hon. Member would not press the matter to a division.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said that there was one point which the First Lord of the Treasury had lost sight of. He quite agreed that it was most important that the Education Committee should have power delegated to it, between meetings of the County Council; but the right hon. Gentleman did not realise the importance of reserving power to the County Council to raise any question it liked.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The County Council will have that power.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said that, if the word "stand" were retained, no Member of the County Council would be allowed to move a resolution in reference to a matter delegated to the Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not agree with the hon. Member.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said that that was the practice in County Councils. The Chairman would declare any such resolution out of order; whereas, if the word "be" were inserted; it would reserve to members of the County Council, the same power that they had over all other matters of local government. Therefore, it was very important that the word "be" should be substituted.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said he would not have intervened were it not for the interruption of the First Lord of the Treasury during his hon. friend's remarks. His hon. friend had stated the practice correctly. If a resolution were brought forward on a subject which had been referred to the committee, then the general sense of the Council would refuse to entertain it on the ground that it was before the committee, and that it would be only waste of time to consider it.

(3.48) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 200; Noes 100. (Division List, No. 479.)

AYES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.

Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S. Edm'nds

Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry

Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J G (Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n-und-Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank

Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. SirWilliam
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt.Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden.)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid,SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Srachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,JA(Glamorg'n,Gower
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley,George(York,W.R)
Williams,Osmond(Merioneth)
Wilson,HenryJ.(York,W.R.)
Woodhouse,SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whitley and Mr. Humphreys-Owen.

(4.5.) MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said the Amendment which he now proposed to move was necessary, if not almost consequential. He moved to insert after the word "committee" the words "who shall consider the same forthwith and report thereon with despatch to the Council." It was unnecessary to make any long observations with regard to this Amendment, because the necessity for it had been duly pointed out in the speeches made upon the previous Amendments. The object was to prevent delay: and the principle that there should not be much delay having been laid down, there was no reason why the principle should not be put into the Bill by the insertion of these words. He hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment he now begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, after the word 'committee' to insert the words 'who shall consider the same forthwith and report thereon with despatch to the council.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.), in supporting the Amendment, said there was one very important question which he would be glad if the Government could enlighten the House upon. How often would the County Committees be prepared to sit? Those who were acquainted with the procedure of the School Boards would know that, as a rule, a School Board met fortnightly and that in the alternate weeks the various committees of the Board met to deal with current matters. If this matter was to be left vague and uncertain there was great force in the Amendment. If, on the other hand, they were to understand that the committee would be called together at not too great intervals of time, then they would know that these matters would be automatically considered and reported on within a reasonable time. He hoped the Government would throw some light upon this matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood that if there was any delay the County Council could act on its own initiative; but he did not think that appeared on the face of this Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education. Would the hon. Gentleman make that clear by the insertion of words?

MR. BRYCE said the difficulty under which they had laboured with these committees in the last three Amendments had been the same, and that was that these committees would be given a quite independent position. If it was to be a committee of the County Council in the ordinary sense, and one that could be told when to report, a committee with regard to which the County Council could dismiss some of the members if they chose, these difficulties could not arise. The Government in this case would see that some uncertainty existed in the minds of the education authorities in the country, and he desired to know whether the local education authorities would be able to give general powers to these committees. He thought many of these difficulties would not arise in practice, because in most cases the matter would be settled by the delegation given in another portion of the Clause. But as this was a power of reference he thought it was desirable that the Attorney General should express the views of the Government clearly.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire had asked how often it was contemplated the Education Committee were going to meet. That, of course, must depend upon the amount of business they had to do. He rather deprecated laying down a hard and fast line for all parts of the country, but he should say they would meet as often as the School Board did now. With regard to the question of the hon. Member for Carnarvon as to the initiative of the County Council under given circumstances, and to the question of the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen, what was contemplated was this; if the report did not come up in proper time the local education authority itself should act, and he would suggest to the consideration of hon. Members whether some such words as these would not remove all doubt in the matter. The Clause would then read thus:—

> "All matters relating to the exercise by the Council of their powers under this Act shall stand referred to the Education Committee, and the Council, before exercising any such powers, shall, unless in their opinion the matter is urgent, receive and consider the report (if any) of the Education Committee with respect to the matter in question."

MR. BRYCE thought those words were a great improvement, and they went to show that the discussion on the last few Amendments had not been wasted.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS pointed out that, except by implication, these words did not tell the committees that they were to report. His Amendment said they were to "report with despatch" to the authority. He regretted the Government would not accept the Amendment.

Question put and negatived.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that owing to the very recent time in which the Clause had been remodelled by the Government, it had been impossible for those representing County Councils to consider it in its new shape. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Education had said the County Councils would be their own executive. He submitted that in large counties it would be practically impossible for them to be their own executive in educational matters. Owing to the size of the Councils, and the working of this Bill, it would be impossible to carry it out, unless there was a large amount of delegation. There were many details which no County Councils would require to have brought before them, and if these committees were to have to report all the details, the agenda would become most voluminous. The words of the Amendment as they stood would make many cases play into the hands of obstructionists on the Councils, and reports might be delayed in matters with which immediate action was necessary. The question of consent to the appointment of a teacher, for instance, was a matter which could not be delayed for months until the Council could deal with it; it required to be dealt with at once by the committee. If every matter of that kind, which in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred would not raise any question of fierce controversy or political difference, had to be delayed until it could be brought before the whole Council, administration would be greatly embarrassed and serious complaints would arise. The Secretary to the Board of Education had used the expression "except in urgent cases," but there was no such exception made in the Clause. The words as they stood were far too wide, and he suggested it would be better that the Clause should read "to the Education Committee, and the Council may delegate," and so on, "and subject to such delegation the committee shall report to the Council." His only object was to have words inserted which would smooth the working of the Act in large counties, and he hoped the Government would accept his remarks in the spirit in which they had been made.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out from the word 'and' down to the word 'the' in line 4."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said it was clear from his explanation of the Amendment that the hon. Member for East Somersetshire feared that the Councils would interfere unduly with the Education Committees. The evident intention of the Government was that these committees, like all other committees of the County Council, should be subject in all things to, and liable to be corrected, if necessary, by the Council. The hon. Member had spoken of "swollen agendas" and the difficulty of getting through the work. The reports might be very bulky, but they would not appear on the agenda. One of the reasons which had prompted the hon. Member's action was probably his experience on the County Council of Somerset, where his reports on technical education had had sometimes to be strongly opposed by the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury and himself (the hon. Baronet). As to the provision "playing into the hands of the obstructionists," it was occasionally necessary for councillors to obstruct when they had gentlemen as chairmen of the Technical Education Committees who endeavoured recklessly to spend the money of the ratepayers, and the object of the Amendment apparently was to lessen the control of the ratepayers' representatives over these committees. The practical result of the Amendment would be that the County Council would have to pay the bill, while the Education Committee called whatever tune they chose and spent the ratepayers' money without restriction. It was very necessary that these committees should report, and that these reports should be confirmed by the Council before money was spent. He, therefore, should strongly oppose the Amendment.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the hon. Member for East Somerset had to a certain extent answered his own objections. He had pointed out that if delay was likely to take place in matters of urgency, extensive powers of delegation would have to be given, and that was exactly what the Clause provided for two lines lower down. The Government proposed to give the local authority extensive powers of delegation for the very purpose of meeting cases of urgency, preventing unnecessary delay, and thereby obviating the inconvenience feared by his hon. friend. Nevertheless the Government, while they did not wish there to be any doubt or difficulty as to the capacity of these two bodies to transact with the utmost possible celerity the business in which they both were interested, would be prepared to accept an Amendment in the following form if agreeable to the hon Member, viz., after "powers shall" to insert "unless in their opinion the matter is urgent, receive and consider the report," etc. The words "if any" would then become unnecessary.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON thought the words just suggested made the matter worse than before. He feared that those who had to administer the Act would consider that in all cases they had to report to the Council before any powers could be exercised, and that would constantly doom the whole machinery to inaction. The words "unless the matter is urgent" would only emphasise the point still more. Take the appointment of a schoolmaster to a post actually vacant. Was that a matter of urgency or not? Under the powers of delegation given in the latter part of the Clause the Education Committee might do a great deal without reference, if that part of the Clause stood alone, but if in the first part it was distinctly stated that the Council, except in cases of urgency, were to consider the report of the committee, a great many County Councils would consider that all decisions upon matters which went before the Education Committee were to be brought up for confirmation before being carried into execution. That, he thought, would place a great stumbling-block in the way of the management of these committees.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE was glad the Government had declined to accept the Amendment. If they had done so, they would simply have whittled away the concession made earlier in the debate, viz., that this committee should be a committee of the Council, dependent on the Council, and that the Council should be the supreme authority. Under the Amendment, the committee would become a sort of statutory body like a watch committee, or a joint police committee, or one of the county governing bodies in Wales, having power to act independently, without the sanction of the authority. The fears of hon. Members as to delay were groundless, because the powers of delegation in this matter would be the same as in others. In small matters the committee would have complete power, but matters of substance would have to be reported upon to the Council. Questions of principle would be settled by the superior authority, but matters of routine would be left to the committee. As to the Amendment of the Attorney General, he thought it would not in any way interfere with the expeditious working of the scheme. It would simply give power to the Council in matters which they decreed to be urgent, and they, after all, were the judges of urgency. So far from interfering with the expedition, he thought it would tend to smooth matters and help the scheme to work well

(4.30.) Sir JOSEPH LEESE thought the words suggested should not be accepted, because, if they were inserted, the County Council would be controlled by its own committee.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, to leave out the words 'if any.'"—(*Sir Robert Finlay.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Words [of Sir William Anson's original Amendment, as amended] inserted.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he desired to move the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Anglesey. The danger of having an irresponsible body was that they were not disposed to take into account the opinion of the majority of the people in whose interests they were supposed to act. If they had to give an account of their stewardship to a body of electors they would probably act differently to what they would otherwise do. It was quite possible under this Bill that a majority of those acting on these Committees which would be primarily responsible for education within that area would be men who had not been elected by a vote of the ratepayers and had perhaps never come into contact with them. They might have too much expert representation. The Welsh system was getting too much under the influence of experts, and there was a general complaint that against the highly scientific and technical experts the ordinary laymen had no chance. If they overloaded these Boards with experts who took a high scientific line they would not get an efficient educational system. These experts were always running fads of their own. What they wanted was a majority of the representatives of the people to act like jurymen on the jury system. It was a very good thing to have such men on the Board as assessors, but the majority should consist of the ordinary typical representative of the electors. This would give them a much more healthy system than a policy run by experts. He thought it was important that they should have on these boards men who had got a direct sense of responsibility to the rates they were spending to whom they were responsible. That was one of the reasons for which he urged this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 33, to leave out sub-Section (*a*), and insert, (*a*) 'That a majority of the committee shall be members of the Council.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (*a*) stand part of the Clause."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that the Government were agreed in desiring that a majority of the Education Committee should be members of the local authority, and the form of words which they were prepared to accept was as follows—

"For the appointment by the Council of at least a majority of the Committee who shall be members of the Council unless the Council shall otherwise determine."

The Government left it optional to this extent that if the local Education Committee deliberately, by express resolution, decided that it would not have a majority of its own body on the Committee, it should be competent for them to take that course.

(4.45.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he was afraid that the words suggested by the Government only showed the weakness of their proposal. Hon. Members knew perfectly well that this business, especially in the rural districts, would be heavy and irksome. When they considered that this committee would be expected to meet frequently, and that the meetings would probably be held in the county town, it might be very convenient for the members of the County Council, whose residences were some distance away, to say that it would be very much better to leave men behind them as substitutes in order to avoid the necessity of attending themselves on those occasions. He could perfectly see that this provision might be very generally adopted. He did not think that ought to be allowed if they wanted to maintain the principle that a majority were to be men responsible to the ratepayers, and that was the vital question. They knew perfectly well what this delegation would be. The people who would really do the administrative work of this measure were the people who lived in the immediate neighbourhood of the place where the meetings were to be held, because people who lived in the districts would not attend unless they were under obligation to do so. By the proposal of the Government the committee, instead of being representative of the ratepayers of the whole county, would be representative really only of those who lived in the locality of the county town. The business would fall into the hands of a very narrow circle of people living around the place where the business was done. That was a practical disadvantage which would arise in the working of the Bill, and they ought to maintain on a sound principle that a majority should be elected by the ratepayers.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said he was bound to say, as far as the large communities were concerned, that the Government proposal was very much better than the Amendment proposed from the opposite Benches. The work of the Councils, especially in the large communities, had most enormously increased since their establishment, and indeed since the last quarter of a century. They worked, as the House was aware, through committees. Recently they had established free libraries, art galleries, industrial schools, art schools, technical schools, and gas and water committees, the last named involving immense work, and rearing men of first-class business capability. The Councils were now establishing workmen's dwellings, which also involved, like many of the committees, enormous work. Now Parliament was proposing to impose on the Councils the control of education. All these things had made the Finance Committee one of great importance, the expenditure having increased and the debts accumulated. It was no exaggeration to say that since the Municipal Corporations Acts were passed the work of these bodies had increased twenty-five or thirtyfold. Their *personnel*, however, was not greatly improving; elections were chiefly fought on political grounds, and first-class men were often rejected—thus their failure to pronounce tne shibboleth of a particular party. In fact many large municipalities were practically run and controlled by five or six men. These bodies were incapable of taking on greatly increased work. It was extremely likely that the imposition of these fresh duties would be the occasion and cause of the reconsideration of their constitution.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the hon. Member for North Birmingham was not a friend of the Bill and preferred the School Boards to the local authorities. Had he been a friend of the Bill his proposals would have been strange ones. His argument was that the work which those great bodies had to perform was already sufficient to engage all their energies. The ground on which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire supported the Amendment made it necessary to move a further Amendment. He spoke of elected Members who were in direct touch with the constituencies, but in many counties the aldermen were those who had been defeated candidates at the election. Therefore they were not in direct touch with the electorate. In some cases they did not represent the opinions of the electorate on certain subjects, but in other cases they were the very men whom hon. Members would wish to have on the committee. An Amendment should be made providing that the half or majority who were to be in touch with the electorate should be really elected members of the Council. He proposed to move to insert the word "elective" before "members."

*THE CHAIRMAN said there was a difficulty in allowing that Amendment to be moved now. The proposal before the Committee was that certain words be left out. He suggested that the best plan would be for the right hon. Baronet to move his Amendment as an Amendment to a proposal which the Government would bring forward later on.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he would do that. The First Lord of the Treasury, in recommending the Bill, had told them that it was based on popular election, and that the controlling body would be a popularly elected body in touch with the people and representative of their opinions. How very far were they from that principle at present! Even with the adoption of the Government Amendment they would be far from it. The County Council divisions were based on a threefold consideration—area, rateable value, and population. There was no real representation of the opinions of the people on account of the fact that area and rateable value were factors taken into consideration. They were very far from popular representation in the constitution of the County Councils, but even with County Councils so elected upon such a franchise and upon such areas—taking into consideration rateable value and acreage—they did not trust them with the administration of this Bill. They were only going to allow them as an option to have a majority of the committee members of the Council. The duties to be discharged by the Committee were very considerable, and on that committee there should be a majority representing the voting power of the district.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if the hon. Member for Anglesey would be prepared to withdraw his Amendment, an Amendment on the same point would be moved by his hon. friend behind him which embodied the general views of the Government.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said he was not anxious to have two discussions on practically the same subject, and he was quite willing to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 34, after the word 'Committee,' to insert the words 'who shall also be members of the Council unless the Council shall otherwise determine.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

COLONEL ROBERT WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said he was extremely glad that the Government had proposed the Amendment in the form which they had now done. This was just one of those cases in which they must trust the people, and trust the County Councils as to what was best for their own counties. The circumstances of even two adjacent counties might be materially different. One county might have one view as to how the educational work should be carried on, and another county might look at it in another way. Some of them were in direct touch with the schools which they had to manage, and in that case the committee might be a very large one, because their interest would be great and it would be impossible for all its members to be members of the County Council. On the other hand, there were cases where the County Council might well conduct their educational work with a small committee, the majority of which would be members of the Council and to whom the powers of the Council would be delegated. He thought the Government were quite right to leave it to the County Councils themselves to manage this question, and it seemed to him that it would be unduly fettering the powers of the County Councils to adopt any other words than those proposed.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said that the only point at issue was as to whether or not they should give a direction to the County Council as to the constitution of the committee. This Bill was full of distrust of the local authorities and hedged them round with restrictions and limitations of their power from beginning to end. If they were agreed that the majority of the committee should be members of the Council there was no reason why that should not be inserted in the Bill. It seemed to him that they were far away from the direct control of the ratepayers if they were going to appoint a committee consisting of three-fourths or seven-eighths of outsiders. He trusted the First Lord would leave the House itself to decide this question, which was not controversial.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he thought it was generally acknowledged in this country that one of the great wants in regard to education was lack of popular enthusiasm. But they could not cultivate enthusiasm unless they insisted on the representatives of the people being closely bound up with the administration of educational affairs. Without that there was great loss to the country. The Government had given no indication as to why they thought there should not be a majority of members of the Council on the committee. He could not see how the disadvantage of the committee having close touch with the people was to be balanced by having experts on it.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) said that this was not a matter in which they should indicate the proportion of the members of the committee which should be members of the Council and which should be chosen from the outside. After all, that would have to be settled by the scheme. It was a matter which should be governed by the individual circumstances of a particular Council or a particular locality. It must be a very pleasing thing in a town where the borough councillors were always ready to attend to matters of this sort. But he was certain that if they had to deal with a large agricultural county a committee the majority of which was selected from the County Council would be so large as to be absolutely unwieldy, or they would have to leave off the committee a very considerable number of people scattered over different parts of the county.

(5.10.) MR. BRYCE said that besides the two alternatives already suggested, there was another method. The scheme itself might provide that there should be always a majority of the committee members of the Council unless the Council should determine from time to time. He thought that would be more in conformity with the views to which the Government had given expression. On the general question he could only say that he had been much impressed by the views of the hon. Member for North Birmingham, who had pointed out with great force the enormously increased functions which had devolved on the Town Councils. In the main, he thought, that was a desirable result, but the consequence was the heaping of duties on duties upon the members, and if a majority of the committee were to be members of the Town Council the superintendence of all matters relating to elementary and secondary education would throw on them an enormous addition to their already heavy tasks. He admitted the difficulty, but, after all, the vital principle here was that these bodies must be responsible to the people, and unless they had a majority of members of the County Council on the committee there could not be that responsibility. The hon. Member for North Birmingham ought to have thought of the difficulties which he had pointed out, before supporting the Government on this Bill. In the Borough Councils the difficulty was one of time and in the Urban Councils one of space, but this Committee could not, even for the sake of avoiding those difficulties, forego the vital principle of direct responsibility. For these reasons he supported the Amendment.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said with regard to this matter the right hon. Gentleman opposite seemed to be carried away by sentiment. The responsibility to the people might not be direct, but there was an indirect responsibility which was very real, and really amounted to the same thing. Some things which were indirect were far more real and binding than if they were direct. Here they had the County Councils who were the direct representatives of the people; and if these bodies which represented the electors chose to select persons not upon their body, they had decided a difficult and delicate matter as seemed to them best. The objection of the right hon. Gentleman was a sentimental objection which ought to be set aside by those who desired to arrive at the best educational result. The Committee had heard a good deal as to the harm that was going to be done by the extinction of the School Boards, but the members of the School Boards in the large towns might still remain charged with the duties of education, by becoming members of the new Education Committees. But if these committees were to be crowded with members of Borough Councils, there would be no room for the members of these School Boards. When we trust a body we ought to trust it entirely. Having set up the County Council as the authority they ought not to say to it, "You shall select as we like and not as you like."

MR. M'KENNA said he would agree that it was right to trust a body entirely if that body was to be responsible to the public. What they were asking for was real public control and not delegated public control. He complained that under this Clause a County Council could form a scheme under which there could be no real public control by another County Council which came after them. What they asked was that no County Council should be able to pledge another County Council by its scheme. His real object, however, in rising, was to ask the First Lord of the Treasury to consider the appeal made by his hon. friend that this matter should be left to the unfettered will of the House to deal with.

*MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) thought that much that had been said with regard to direct control was beside the mark. No committee which had to report to its principal body—which might have its decisions and recommendations reviewed and upset by that body—could be said to have direct responsibility. He was in favour of directing the County Council under the scheme to put on its Education Committee a majority of its own members, for the reason that it was not at all unlikely that as time went on, if the committee was composed of members who were not on the County Council, a certain jealousy would establish itself between the Education Committee and the Council, a thing not at all to be desired. He had noticed that in London the County Council at times almost regretted the power they had given to the Education Committee, and he felt sure that the feeling would have been intensified if the majority of that committee had consisted of members who were not members of the County Council. In the interests of education generally, it was desirable that it should be laid down that a majority of the committee should be composed of members of the Council. He hoped that that would be the line on which the decision of this Committee would go, and that when this matter came to be decided, the Government would listen to the appeal that had been made, and leave it to the unfettered judgment of the Committee.

*MR. CHANNING said the right hon. Member for Oxford University had spoken of this as a sentimental grievance. That might be so if they were dealing with a University. But they were dealing now with the control of elementary education. He recognised the value of the concession the Government had made so far as it went, but he hoped they would give a free hand to their followers in the lobby, and that some weight should be given to the argument in favour of giving unqualified discretion to secure that most members of these committees should be members of the County Council. The greatest merit of the School Boards was due to the fact that they sprang directly from the people and were directly responsible to the people. This Amendment was supported because if they were in any way to preserve the state of things in which the grand results of the School Board system had been attained, they must aim at some system which would supply the same direct incentives to the people to take a direct interest in education. The people would naturally throw themselves enthusiastically into the work of education if they were left free to choose for themselves the persons who would best conduct the education of their children. One of the gravest objections to the scheme of the Bill was the inevitable exclusion of Labour representatives. Frequently on the School Boards in industrial towns labour representatives had done most efficient work. He could bear personal witness to the enormous service which Labour representatives had rendered on the School Boards.

MR. TALBOT: Then why do you not leave room for them?

MR. CHANNING said it was far better to leave it to the electors of these towns to appoint the men whom they had found by experience to be best fitted for the work, and who had acted locally in the furtherance of education among the working classes. One of the startling results of the School Boards was the widened interest the labouring classes took in education. This was demonstrated in the action taken by the trades unions and the great co-operative societies of this country to insist on the maintenance of the School Boards, the expansion of higher education under the School Board, and the general development of education. This was an aspect of the question which the committee should weigh well before coming to a decision. So far as education was concerned, there was no more cogent lever than to rouse the active interest of the working classes themselves. The proposals of this Clause seemed to be a very bad substitute for what at present existed. Even if the Amendment was accepted, what would happen in the rural counties? Certainly, even in a progressive county like Northamptonshire, they would find a disposition on the part of the members of the County Council placed on these committees to absent themselves from the committee, and leave the work to be done by the experts and permanent officials. That would be a serious evil, which would be enormously aggravated if the option were introduced into this Clause.

(5.30.) SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE reinforced the appeal made to the First Lord of the Treasury to allow this to be an open question. He pointed out that the borough local authorities had met and unanimously passed a resolution in favour of this Amendment.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE moved to amend the Amendment, by substituting the word "councillors" for the expression "members of the Council." He explained that he had already made his speech upon this Amendment when he moved it previously, and he was ruled out of order, and, therefore, it was not necessary to speak again. He might just, however, say that the effect would be to confine the proposal to the elected members of the Council, and to leave aldermen out. They could, however, still be co-opted members of the Education Committee. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'members of the Council,' and insert the word 'councillors.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'members of the Council' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was not aware that there was any analogy in our legislation affecting Borough and County Councils for any such invidious distinction between councillors and aldermen as that proposed by the right hon. Baronet. He was sure that it would be a profound mistake to introduce it into this Bill. He would not argue whether the existing system was improved or injured by the fact that there were certain members of the Borough and County Councils who had not the same immediate election by the electorate as the councillors; but, if that fact did constitute an injury to the system, let them wait for a general reconsideration of the whole scheme. For his own part, he suspected that those who were practically acquainted with the work of the Borough and County Councils, whatever their theoretical views, did not think the quality of those bodies was injured by the fact that aldermen served upon them.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS pointed out that some of the enlightened County Councils of Wales, such as he was acquainted with, declined to make any one an alderman at all unless he had first been elected a councillor, and the practical effect of his right hon. friend's proposal would be to exclude from the Education Committee some of the best members of the Council. As he was not satisfied as to what would be the practical result of this Clause, he should vote in favour of this Amendment.

(5.43.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 232; Noes, 122. (Division List, No. 480.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dix'n
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George, (York W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Charles Dilke and Sir Brampton Gurdon.

(5.57.) MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH, in moving the omission of the words "unless the Council shall otherwise determine," said he did not desire to repeat the arguments he had already laid before the Committee. The object he and his friends had in view was to make the Education Committee, as far as the majority of its members were concerned, directly responsible to the ratepayers. This was a matter which did not trench on the question of religious education, it was simply a matter of government; it was therefore a question on which the members of the Committee might very well be left to exercise their own judgment without taking Party ties into consideration, and he appealed to the First Lord of the Treasury not to appoint the Party Whips to tell in the division.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'unless the Council shall otherwise determine.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have been appealed to two or three times in the course of this debate to make the present question what is called an open question, and not to employ the ordinary means by which Party controversy is carried on in this House. I do not think that is a judicious course to pursue, and perhaps the Committee will bear with me if, in a word I explain the attitude of the Government in this matter. I stated on the Second Reading of the Bill the perfect readiness of the Government to consider whether the framing of the Bill should be modified in the direction of placing a larger number of the members of Borough and County Councils on the Education Committees. Since then I have on many occasions declared in this House and in the country that the Government do favour any change in the Bill which would tend in the direction of making a majority on these Education Committees a majority of the Council itself. So much for our declaration in the past. Now, as to the actual merits of the case. We are all agreed that the true ideal we ought to aim at is that there should be a majority of the Council on the committee. The only difference between us is as to whether we should lay down an absolutely rigid rule upon that subject or not. I am quite clear that it would be the height of folly on the part of this House, not having before it, and incapable of having before it, all the varying circumstances of the local authorities of this country, to make any such rigid declaration as that which the hon. Gentleman desires. I am informed that there are County Councils who think it would be quite impossible to carry on the work thrown upon them by this Bill if they are required to have a majority of their own members on the committee.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman opposite gives to that an ironical cheer, and he seems to think that there is no such difficulty. I should rather hope that this was not the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite in their less controversial moments. I thought it was one of the main factors in the case for Home Rule—whatever may be the merits or demerits of that policy—that before we get to Home Rule there is to be some method of training in regard to the duties now being thrown upon existing local authorities. If that is one of the things upon which the various sections of the Liberal Party are agreed, it is hard to attack us because we are taking a step in that direction by asking these great authorities to deal with the work of education. I had no intention of dragging these high Party politics into what I consider a purely business subject. It is from a business point of view that I appeal to the Committee. What would be our position if we passed this Bill with the rigid declaration which hon. Gentlemen opposite desire, and then found that this or that County or Borough Council could not carry out the work entrusted to it because we laid upon it this condition? We should look exceedingly foolish, and the work of education in that area would be greatly hampered. I cannot think that the dignity and efficiency of this House would gain by placing itself in a position of that kind. Surely this arrangement—I will not call it a compromise—is the right arrangement. We laid down in unmistakeable characters on the face of this Bill that what we desired to see was a majority of the Council on the Education Committee, but as we contemplate the possibility that there may be cases where that is an impracticable course, like sensible men we say that after all the education authority—Borough or County Council, as the case may be—is the best judge, and must be allowed a loophole of escape if the rigid system puts them into an impossible situation. I hope, Sir, that will commend itself to the Committee as a common-sense plan, but it seems to me that the danger of allowing ourselves to be hurried away by any over-mastering affection for a purely theoretical ideal is so great that confusion and difficulty would arise if County Councils or Borough Councils could not carry out the burden of work we are putting upon them. I must ask the House to consider this as a question vitally bound up with the practical character of the Bill.

MR. BRYCE: Will the Attorney General give us an answer to the question put to him about the scheme by the hon. Gentleman opposite?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: With regard to the question put to me by the hon. Member for North Birmingham, the scheme should contain a provision that the majority appointed by the Council should be members of the Council unless the Council should otherwise determine.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The right hon. Gentleman opposite first laid down what he considers a valuable principle, and then he provides what he has described in a very accurate phrase as "a loophole of escape" from that principle. The loophole of escape is one which very many of us will feel is the one which will most likely be generally adopted, especially in the rural counties, and what I fear is that in these counties the loophole of escape will become the rule and not the exception.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland) said this was one of the Amendments put before the Birmingham Unionist Conference, and the verdict was that they were almost unanimously in favour of it, for the "Noes" were only one. They knew that the Government did not pay much attention to the opinion of Birmingham in this matter, for a much more important resolution passed at the Unionist Conference was in regard to assistant teachers, and that recommendation was summarily rejected by the right hon. Gentleman the Premier. The reason why they proposed to omit those words was that they considered them as a very small improvement on the original proposal of the Bill. Of course there was no real danger in those counties interested in education that they would not appoint a majority of actual members of the Council upon the committees. They were really arguing from those counties that were indifferent in regard to the working of the educational system. It was only too likely that a county would say, "We won't take any trouble, but put the matter into the hands of those who understand it, such as clergymen and school teachers, and we will let them run our business for us." It was just those counties that would escape their duty by making use of this exemption. The result of this would be that people would be as indifferent in regard to education as they were before, and the whole matter would be left in the hands of the small ring who now run the County Councils. He did not believe in unelected persons. There was a great deal to be said for the learned men who were not elected, but if a man really cared about education he would not mind putting up for the County Council election. He did not think that any very large number of people would be excluded by leaving the committee to be entirely composed of county councillors. That was not, however, the proposal of the Bill. There was still half of the Education Committee under the present proposal who would not be county councillors. All they were asking for now was that the majority should consist of county councillors, and all the rest could still be chosen from the outside.

*CAPTAIN BALFOUR (Middlesex, Hornsey) said the Government had made great concessions in regard to the managers, and it was now clear that the managers would have very little power at all left in their hands. [OPPOSITION laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite laughed, but that was quite true, although it was a question which they need not go into again. Now they had come to the constitution of the Education Committees, and he supported very strongly the proposal that it would be desirable that a majority of the members of the committee should be county councillors. The hon. Gentleman opposite had alluded to the Birmingham resolution, but he wished to point out that that resolution was passed before the discussions on this particular point in the Bill had taken place. It was perfectly clear now that the Education Committees would be just as much under the control of the County Councils as the managers. This was not so when the resolution was passed at the Birmingham Conference. Many hon. Members had doubts as to how much power the committee was to have, but now it was clear that every report would have to be passed by the local education authority. He failed to understand the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the local education authority was not a popularly elected body. He thought they were agreed that it was desirable that the majority of the Education Committee should be county councillors. But in large counties there might be two or three Education Committees, and there might be an insufficient number of councillors to provide the majorities. Therefore, it was a question of convenience and of the practical working of the Bill, and he thought the Committee would do well to carry out the proposal of the Government.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said the First Lord of the Treasury had argued that if a large Council were compelled to have a majority of their members on the Education Committee together with their present work they would have too much to do. He had himself used that argument as a reason why the School Boards should not be abolished.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Councils could do the work under the provisions of the Bill, but not under the provisions of the Bill as the hon. Member proposed to amend it.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was now using the argument as against the argument for the abolition of the great School Boards. The Prime Minister appealed to the Committee from the business point of view. He and others appealed to the right hon. Gentleman three months ago from the business point of view, but the Government determined to municipalise the local control. It had been said that that was the original idea of Mr. Gladstone's Bill. But if they were going to municipalise control they must do it thoroughly. They must not have a spurious form, as they would have under this Bill. The least they should insist upon was that the majority of the members of the Education Committee should be members of the Municipal Council. That was the plea of the famous Liberal Unionist conference two or three weeks ago. The Birmingham Unionists had not gained their point in regard to the management of the schools, and he believed they were in a worse position now than they were before.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Member had left out of account the fact that the Amendment passed this afternoon made the Borough Councils and the County Councils supreme in all elementary education.

DR. MACNAMARA said he admitted that the education authority was to be supreme, but the work was so great that they must devolve their powers, and there was no popular control unless they insisted that the Education Committee should be a representative committee. The committees could not be representative unless the majority in all cases were members of the municipal authority. The Government Bill of 1896 insisted very properly that a majority of the members of the Education Committee should be members of the municipal body. That also was the scheme of the Government Bill of 1890. In the Secondary Education Bill of last year it was quite specific that it was not to be left to the municipal people themselves to say whether they would do it or not, there was no loophole, they were placed under obligation in all cases to have a majority of the committee members of their own body. He said, with all respect, that it was not sincere for the Government to state that they were giving popular control if in the next breath they handed the whole thing over by delegation to another body, unless that body had a majority of representative people.

(6.23.) SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said the issue was whether they would tie up the hands of the Municipal and County Councils, with whose local circumstances they were imperfectly acquainted, or whether they would leave this question to be decided by the Municipal and County Councils. The county of Middlesex, outside London, contained a number of large urban districts, and he understood it was the opinion of a great many persons on the Middlesex County Council that the only way in which this Act could be efficiently worked was by having, not one committee, but separate committees—a committee for all the great urban districts which would have the control of their own elementary instruction. It was quite impossible for the County Council of Middlesex to find a sufficient number of members to give them a majority on all these Committees. This plan, which the Middlesex County Council thought best, would have to be abandoned if the Committee insisted upon a majority of all these committees being members of the Council. The Council might evade the clause by putting in nominal members who were understood never to attend.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the difficulty to which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded could be dealt with by Clause 15 of the Bill, which empowered devolution. He did not think objections put forward in the First Lord's speech were worth consideration in this matter. But he gathered that the First Lord was disposed to make this a Party question, and that he would regard the rejection of this particular Amendment to be a matter of importance. He desired to remind the right hon. Gentleman that he had already given the House a pledge on this point. The Prime Minister, in the Second Reading debate on the Bill, intimated that he would leave the decision of the subject to the House.

*The CHAIRMAN: That quotation has been already given once or twice. [An Hon. Member: "It is not the same quotation."] I would remind the hon. Member that there is a Standing Order against repetition.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, was an argument against his own Bill of 1896. If it was mischievous to tie up the hands of the local authority now, he should like to know why the right hon. Gentleman introduced the proposal in 1896. Middlesex was in existence then.

Sir JOHN GORST: I am wiser now.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE hoped that before the end of this debate the right hon. Gentleman would be wiser still, and that he would be able to support the Amendment. The words "unless the Council shall otherwise direct" made absolute nonsense of the Government's own Amendment. The insertion of those words, "unless the Council shall otherwise direct," was perfectly meaningless. This was a very characteristic concession of the Government. To satisfy the Birmingham Liberal Unionists, the Government said that the majority of the members of the Education Committee should be members of the Council; and then to satisfy the opponents of public control, the Government added "unless the Council shall otherwise direct." By the text of the Bill the Council could, if they chose, appoint an Education Committee of their own members, and all that the Amendment did was, by a system of tautology, to give them the same power. The object of this was, of course, to mislead public opinion outside.

Mr. M'KENNA said that under the Clause, first, all matters were to be referred to the Education Committee, except rating, and second, all powers could be delegated to the Committee, also except rating. Now, unless the Amendment were accepted, no single member of the Council need be a member of the committee, and if the committee were to have all the administrative powers, financial control was divorced from administrative control. When the Bill was introduced, that was the one thing which, it was said, the Government were going to set their face against. He asked the First Lord whether the Bill carried out the intention of the Government in placing financial and administrative control in the same hands. Unless the right hon. Gentleman accepted the Amendment he would be controverting the primary principles of the Bill, and failing to carry out the pledges given on the Second Reading.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS thought that the observation of his hon. friend was perfectly just, and ought to be carefully considered, especially by the late Vice-President of the Committee of Council.

Did the right hon. Gentleman think that in a Bill of this kind, which was creating an educational authority, it should be made possible that in appointing a committee not a single member of the authority should be on that committee? As his hon. friend the Member for the Northern Burghs had pointed out, the concession was no concession at all. They were enjoined to trust the people. The Secretary to the Board of Education said, "I tell you from the University of Oxford that the people ought to be trusted!" The position of the opponents of the Bill was perfectly sound on this matter. The Government were creating a new education authority; they had been preaching to the local authorities that it was their duty to look after the education of the people; but what was the use of now saying that these bodies might be too busy to look after the education of the people? If the sub-stratum of the Bill was sound, they ought to say to the local authorities, "We shall not delegate these educational duties to others." For his part, he was opposed to bringing in outsiders. [An hon. Member on the MINISTERIAL Benches: What! no woman?] Certainly no woman. He was, however, not going to forestall the discussion on that matter. He had always voted against the extension of the franchise to women. His opinion was that women did anything whatever better than men in administration or government. He insisted that in creating these educational authorities they were insulting them by saying that they should attend to their duties. The result of the Clause would be that the committee might be composed of men outside the education authority. Take, for instance, the County Council of Gloucester, of which the right hon. Baronet who sat for one of the Divisions of that county was the Chairman. They knew what the right hon. Baronet's views were, and that if he had his way, not one member of the County Council would be appointed to the Education Committee. He would say to the members of the County Council. "You stay with me here and take care of the rates; we will put someone else on the Education Committee." It might be said that was a fantastic illustration, but it was possible. Was it not fair to say to these new authorities, "You must choose out of your own number the best men you can; you must man your committee in such a way that you will be responsible to us for carrying out the functions of the Bill." Everyone who desired to see the efficient working of the Bill, and the extension of the best education of all children should, he thought, vote for the Amendment.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said he would press on the right hon. the Attorney General to say whether it should ever be possible for an Education Committee to be appointed which contained no single member of the educational authority upon it. Was that the decision of the Government?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite had declared that in some cases they might not have on the Education Committee a single member of the Council, and characterised that as fantastic. He said that the suggestion was really preposterous.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said it was preposterous that that should be possible.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he would not waste one moment more in discussing it. The Clause indicated that in a normal and proper state of things, in the absence of special circumstances, there should be a majority of members of Council on the committee. That was indicated as an ideal state of things; but what they recognised was that there might be cases where that could not be secured. Where the members of the County Council were regular in attendance they insisted that there should be a majority of the committee members of the County Council, but if they were not regular in attendance, the controlling power would pass into the hands of experts.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said he again asked an answer to the question: Was it the decision of the Government that it shall ever be legally possible that the committee should not contain a member of the education authority? It was due to the House that the Attorney General should answer that question.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the question had been very courteously put to the Attorney General. There was nothing offensive in it, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman might answer it.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the question assumed that some Council was going to do something that was obviously absurd. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!"] The Government intimated by this Amendment that the proper thing was, in the absence of special circumstances, that the majority of the committee should be members of the Council. The question assumed that the Council were going to be so ridiculous as to appoint the whole of a committee on which there was not even one member of the Council.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: Can they do it?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: As an abstract question of law the thing might be done.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: That is the Government's decision.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: It is perfectly ridiculous to throw out the suggestion.

(6.43.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 125. (Division List, No. 481.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Foster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Joceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Ed.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (K'nt, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon George T (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry

Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw. H
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Maxwell, W J. H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myres, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheff'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York., W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudderrsf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Trevelyan.

Words inserted.

(7.0.) MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN moved to omit sub-Section (*b*). This omission, he urged, was desirable in the interests of the harmonious working of the system. It was important that no section of the members of a committee should be regarded as persons who were fighting the battles of extraneous bodies. The Committee must remember that when a similar scheme was made for the Welsh County Councils, the fullest concession was made to the feeling of the localities. There the appointment of denominational and outside bodies was entirely with the goodwill and assent of the members of those bodies themselves. In England it would be entirely different. County and Borough Councils had the gravest apprehensions, and even went so far as to deny the right of outside bodies to interfere in any way. It was necessary, if these Educational Committees were to be successful, that they should be harmonious in spirit, and that there should be no sectional feeling between the different classes of members on the committee. The County Council, too, would no doubt subsidise secondary schools, and it would be most anomalous if schools which might receive subsidies were to nominate members who might afterwards have to dispense such subsidies.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 35, to leave out sub-Section (*b*)."—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'for the' stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. The majority of the members of a committee would clearly be appointed by the Council, but it was desirable that there should be a power of calling in other "persons of experience in education," and "persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area" to which they were attached. The Committee would see they would have the ordinary state of things, a majority of the Council on the committee, and the duties to be discharged by the committee. If they desired, in the discharge of their duty, to have the assistance of the class of persons mentioned in the sub-Section, they were entitled to have it. The adoption of this Amendment would strike out a Clause which would enable them, in all cases, to secure such assistance if required.

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he thought the Attorney General had not stated quite accurately the effect of this Amendment. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that it was desired to give the Councils power to call in persons to assist them. He submitted that this was a mandatory instruction to them to do so. If the Council should have the option as had been argued, why should the option not be given under paragraph (*b*)? He submitted that this was a mandatory instruction to the Council, whether they thought it wise or not, to add a number of extraneous persons to the governing body of the school. Why should not the Government be consistent in this matter, and act upon the principle of trust in the representatives of the people which they had themselves professed in dealing with the last Amendment?

MR. BRYCE asked what meaning the Government attached to the phrases "persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area," and the nomination by "other bodies." What was in the mind of the Government? These were somewhat objectionable words.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the words first quoted by the right hon. Gentleman were perfectly clear, and surely it was desirable that a committee should have the assistance of persons who were familiar with the schools of the various denominations. With regard to the expression "other bodies," he instanced Owens College as one of the bodies from whom nomination might be desirable.

MR. BRYCE: Would such a body as the association of voluntary schools of a particular denomination come within these words?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I think we had better discuss that when we get to the words.

MR. BRYCE: But might it? Is it legally possible?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Will the words include the Primrose League?

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said the hon. and learned Member had not dealt with the point raised by the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire as to the probability of a number of representatives on the Education Committee being appointed by the grammar schools. He personally was a governor of a grammar school, and if appointed on the Education Committee would be thoroughly acquainted with the needs of that particular grammar school. But all that that grammar school needed was money, and he might be chosen to serve on the committee in the belief that he would be able to exert influence that would result in more money being obtained from the County Council for the grammar school. Within recent years there had been an awakening of public opinion with regard to the conduct of members of public bodies suspected of using their position for their personal advantage. In the case of the grammar school, the representative would probably be a subscriber, and if he could get more money from the County Council it would relieve his own pocket. A man who had no pecuniary interest to serve might be excused if he felt in honour bound to obtain as much money as possible for the school he represented, but it was because he desired to keep our local government and local institutions pure and above suspicion that he pressed the point on the attention of the Committee.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said the character of the motive of this Bill was perhaps more clearly shown in the sub-Section under discussion than in any other. The Committee had heard from the Government their intention with regard to the sectarian schools, viz., that those schools were to remain under sectarian control. But hitherto, parallel with that system in England we had had a system of school government in the hands of the people, under which it was in the power of the people if they felt so disposed to exclude from the government of the national schools all sectarian elements, or to admit those sectarian elements under safeguards as to the fair treatment of all schools. The Government now proposed to deprive the people of that power, and to set up an education authority which was not to be allowed to constitute itself on a popular basis. It was even suggested to the authorities that they need not have a majority of members of the local education authority on the Education Committee, and they were now informed that they must provide for the nominations of other bodies. They were to part with their powers and give them to other bodies, which were not named in the Bill, but which the Attorney General candidly stated were to be of a sectarian type.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I did not say they were to be exclusively of a sectarian type.

MR. ROBSON said the last thing the Attorney General would say was that they would be exclusively of a sectarian type, but he did intimate that they would come from the Wesleyans and Catholics—he was not certain whether he mentioned the Church of England, or whether his candour carried him so far as to name the diocesan associations, which were really the other bodies contemplated in the section. The Government had done better than capture the School Boards; they had destroyed them, and the new authority was being put under an obligation, as clearly expressed as the Government dared in a statute, to allow the sectarians to select those who were to control the schools provided and maintained out of the rates. Upon what principle could the Government justify the proposal that the ratepayers, when they had founded and were maintaining a school, were not to govern that school, but that the so-called education authority were to part with their powers to denominational sect, who might be wholly out of sympathy with popular feeling? If the Government were determined to keep the sectarian schools at the public expense, they might, at any rate, let the schools founded and exclusively maintained by public funds remain under national and not sectarian control. Not only were other bodies to have a power of nominating members on the education committee, but there were to be appointed persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area for which the Council acted. "The various kinds of schools" simply meant the denominational schools, so that the education authority was invited, almost commanded, to delegate part of its powers over rate-supported schools to sectarian associations. That was the meaning of the Bill in every one of its Clauses, but it was for once clearly expressed here and admitted by the Attorney General.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said the hon. and learned Member for South Shields was usually so fair-minded that one could only conclude that he had not really carefully read the Clause The words were clear. The local authority need not consult anybody; it was not necessary that other bodies should nominate. The effect of the hon. and learned Member's speech was that the Government were setting up an authority a large portion of which would necessarily be on the nomination of sectarian bodies. But that was not the effect of the Clause at all. It was only where the local authority deemed it desirable that bodies should be invited to nominate. The only compulsion was that of appointing some other persons who were not members of the Council, and they might appoint such persons on their own selection without the intervention of any other authority whatever. They might do exactly as the Hertford County Council had already done in anticipation of the passage of the Bill. That Council had appointed, to assist and advise them as to the best methods of carrying out the Act, a committee consisting of a majority of members of the County Council, with a number of persons whom they themselves selected—experts in education, having direct knowledge of the needs of the district, and four persons nominated by a society on the invitation of the Council.

An HON. MEMBER: What society?

MR. ERNEST GRAY: The organisation of Teachers for the County of Hertford, a non-political and non-sectarian organisation. No committee could have been better designed for the work, and what had been done by the Hertford County Council would, in his judgment, be done by many other County Councils when the Bill came into operation.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY—REPORT—[5TH NOVEMBER.]

Resolution reported:—

CIVIL SERVICES (1902–3), ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE.

CLASS V.

"That a sum, not exceeding £8,000,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, for a Grant in Aid to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, for expenses consequent upon the termination of the War."

(9.0.) MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said there was no opposition to be raised, so far as he knew, in any quarter of the House, but the Vote was so large and important that it should not pass without the House having full information on some points upon which doubts had arisen. He therefore proposed to ask two or three questions. His first point was that there was an impression in the minds of some people that half the sum of £3,000,000 had already been expended, but he understood that the money had been paid out by the Treasuries of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, and would be repaid when this Vote was sanctioned. Only in that sense had there been an anticipation of the Grant.

The other point was that mainly on account of the somewhat confused manner in which the Estimate was presented, it was not quite clear how the £3,000,000 in the third item was to be apportioned. Items one and two were of the nature of free gifts to the burghers and loyalists respectively, but as to the third item he wished to know if the sum was to be apportioned between the two classes. He understood the Colonial Secretary to say that this amount would be advanced by way of loan to burghers of a better position who could afford to pay interest after a period of two years. He noted in passing that the right hon. Gentleman had carefully guarded himself from saying that the sum of £3,000,000 was a final estimate of what was likely to be required. He made no objection to that. This was the point he desired to have cleared up, whether the advances by way of loan were to be made to burghers only, and not to other persons referred to under the second head. If this was the intention he could scarcely reconcile it with the ambiguous statement in the Estimate, which treated the third head of £3,000,000 as supplemental to the first two heads. The House ought to be told distinctly what was to be the real destination of this last sum. Another point was in reference to the loan. That was intended to be ultimately a charge on the revenues of the Colonies, and he desired to know if the Government could inform the House of the method by which this burden would be imposed on the Colonies. The King by virtue of his Prerogative, could, within certain limits, impose taxation on the Colonies by Order in Council, or create a Government in the Transvaal with power to do this, and, as bearing on the question he desired to ask, he referred to Article 7 of the terms of surrender, in which it was stated that military administration shall at the earliest possible day be succeeded by civil government. What was the status of the Government of these Colonies at this moment? Had the military administration been superseded by civil government? Was it intended to levy taxation to meet the expenses of the loan by Order in Council, or would this be deferred until civil government was established?

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that as he was not present on the previous night there were one or two points he would like to raise in the interests of economy, and from the standpoint of the British taxpayer. It had been perfectly obvious since last May that they would have to meet the first and last items of the Vote. He thought they had got excellent value for the £3,000,000, which was the outcome of a definite contract they had made with their gallant enemies whom they had defeated in the field, but they could not be sure that the items were sufficiently large. On the whole he felt that the statements of the Colonial Secretary were satisfactory, especially as he had promised to keep an open mind. There was a difficulty as to the £2,000,000 which had never been explained. There had been no contract to pay that sum which, as he understood it, was to compensate the people in our own Colonies whose farms had been destroyed by the Boers, and who had suffered from war's desolation. But apparently it was to be mainly given to those who were called the loyalists in the Transvaal. He was not going to suggest that anybody who had suffered severe loss should not be liberally compensated, but as far as he understood it the Government were suggesting that the people for whom we undertook this war had as great claims for compensation as those whose farms had been destroyed. Johannesburg was not destroyed, and the people who went down to Durban were able to get good salaries. There had been great loss through the war, and the taxpayers should not be asked for more than was necessary. In conclusion he would again ask for a clear statement as to the proposed appropriation of this £2,000,000.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The hon. Member for Dundee has put to me one or two questions, which I shall do my best to reply to. I think his main question was as to whether the £3,000,000 was to be in the way of an advance to both the burghers and the loyalists, or to the burghers alone, and he seemed to think that something that was said by my right hon. friend last night was open to some misunderstanding. I have no hesitation in assuring the hon. Gentleman that the sum is intended to be available for the burghers and the loyalists.

MR. LOUGH: Is that the particular loan referred to?

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, the loan at the low rate of interest. I think the hon. Gentleman is under some doubt as to whether this sum was to be devoted to the burghers alone or also to the loyalists.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Colonial Secretary said the burghers.

*MR. RITCHIE: I cannot go into the speech, but I am sure my right hon. friend never intended to convey that. It would be little less than monstrous if we were to make loans to the burghers for the purpose stated and not to those who are our friends. There is no question whatever as to that.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Do not understand me to be arguing against that.

*MR. RITCHIE: Of course not. The speech of the hon. Member is entirely in the other direction. I understood from him that he was rather apprehensive that it should have been so.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Was that the three millions provided for in the terms of surrender?

*MR. RITCHIE: No. The amount fixed in the terms of surrender was, as already stated, a free gift. The three millions was allocated as a free gift, and then there was an indefinite sum arranged for by way of loan at a low rate of interest. That is the item to which the hon. Gentleman has directed my attention, but he need be under no apprehension on that point, whether the loans amount to three millions or more; they would be available for the loyalists and burghers. Then, Sir, the hon. Member asked what method will be adopted for distributing the loan amongst the burghers, and he seemed to be under some apprehension that there might be some sort of military interference—that the money would be distributed by some military authority.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No; I merely asked the question as to Article 7.

*MR. RITCHIE: I thought the hon. Member also asked whether the military administration was to deal with the three millions.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I did not mean that.

*MR. RITCHIE: I understand it so. Of course, we act under the advice of Lord Milner. We shall place this loan on the market when a favourable opportunity arises.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: By what authority?

*MR. RITCHIE: By what authority On our own authority.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: By an Order in Council?

*MR. RITCHIE: No; by our own authority: We shall place the loan on the market, but, of course, we shall have first to get a Bill through this House. We shall have to obtain an Act of Parliament to enable us to guarantee the loan, and then there will have to be an Ordinance in South Africa after the Bill is passed. The loan will then be put on the market, and the three millions will, of course, be repaid to the Government, who advanced the money. The hon. Gentleman for West Islington takes quite a different view from that held by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee. He has nothing whatever to say with regard to Nos. 1 and 3. The one thing he objected to was the two millions to be advanced to the loyalists, and I am sure the House will think the expression he used a very extraordinary one to apply to a matter of this kind. He said that we were not under a contract to do anything for the loyalists. I hope it does not require any contract. It is a plain duty on the Imperial Government to treat those who have been our friends in South Africa certainly not worse than our enemies. That, I should imagine, requires no explanation, and certainly no contract. We consider that we have a moral obligation on our shoulders to see that these men who have stood our friends in South Africa shall not be worse off than those who have been our enemies;

and if there is to be any distinction made between the two, I am quite sure that the balance ought to be in favour of those who stood our friends. The hon. Gentleman has told us about certain gentlemen who came down from Johannesburg and were enjoying themselves at Cape Town. What did these men want compensation for, he said. When the compensation is given, I presume there will be discrimination as to the allocation of the money.

MR. LOUGH: That is what I asked.

*MR. RITCHIE: But the hon. Gentleman seemed to think that because these men were allowed to leave Johannesburg they suffered no injury. Those loyalist friends of ours who have suffered in any way by the war will, so far as our ability goes, be compensated quite to the full, as much as those who have been our enemies. The hon. Gentleman asked what was to be done with those who have suffered from the war in Cape Colony and Natal.

MR. LOUGH asked upon what principle the distribution of the grant to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony rested.

*MR. RITCHIE: We are in consultation with Lord Milner on that subject. All this expenditure will be subject to the supervision of the Comptroller and Auditor General, and we shall have to give a full account of the way in which the money is expended; but to ask me now to tell the House the exact mode by which we have arrived at our calculations as to whether two millions is sufficient or not is to ask more than I can possibly answer. It is sufficient to say that in these matters, as in all other matters, we have been acting in consultation with Lord Milner. I thought my right hon. friend's observations last night were perfectly explicit. I have here a note of what my right hon. friend said, and I will read it to the hon. Gentleman—

> "He wanted to know why this two millions was asked for. Well, Sir, the two millions has nothing to do with the loans in Natal and Cape Colony. For those we have provided otherwise. We have undertaken with the Government of Natal to repay to them the compensation which they have given to those loyal subjects who were injured by the invasion. And we desire and intend that it shall be given on a liberal scale. We have also agreed that a contribution shall be given to those loyal subjects who in the Cape Colony have suffered by the first invasion. I say the first invasion, because we consider that in the case of the second invasion the responsibility lies with the Colony itself. But with regard to the compensation which we are to give in the Cape Colony, we have expressed in the clearest terms our determination that not one penny of Imperial money shall be given to compensate those who have rebelled against the Imperial authority."

That is the policy which my right hon. friend enunciated yesterday, and that is the policy of the Government. I think I have now answered all the questions put to me.

(9.35.) MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he hoped that the right hon. Gentlemen opposite would no longer talk of loyalists. He hoped all were loyalists now, and he thought it would be better that the use of the word should cease. He was glad to hear the reply which had been given to his hon. friend by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. His hon. friend wanted to know what discrimination was to be exercised in giving this £2,000,000 to "other persons." The Colonial Secretary told them that only those burghers who were nearly in destitute circumstances were to have any claim upon the £3,000,000, but he did not say that in regard to those other persons. A great many persons had suffered by the war in England as well as in South Africa. Business and trade had been injured, no doubt, in South Africa. For instance, the mines. They could not be carried on. Were they to understand that these £2,000,000 were to be granted only to persons in a destitute condition, or could anybody put in a claim as having suffered by the war? Mr. Beit, for instance; could he put in a claim for his portion of this £2,000,000? His hon. friend on the Front Bench had asked what was the nature of the present government in the Transvaal. He thought that was germane to this question, because the present Government would have to make conditions in regard to this loan. The Chancellor of the Exchequer appeared to have forgotten that question. Was the present form of government in the Transvaal a military Government? Was there a Council there to act with Lord Milner, or could Lord Milner issue what law he liked, and were those laws binding on the Transvaal people?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I stopped the hon. Member for Dundee when he was proceeding to discuss the mode of Government, and the hon. Member will not be in order in pursuing that subject.

MR. LABOUCHERE said he only wished to look at the matter as a purely financial one. They were asked to provide this £3,000,000, and they were told that it was to be by means of a loan which the Transvaal Government was to pay, but which this country was to guarantee. What security had they got that the people of the Transvaal would take this obligation upon themselves?

*MR. RITCHIE: No security is required. All that will be necessary is an ordinance of the Transvaal Government.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Then there is to be no security, and the only guarantee is to be an ordinance of Lord Milner? That is all I want to know.

*MR. KEMP (Lancashire, Heywood) said they had heard that compensation was to be paid by the Cape Government to those loyalists who had suffered by the second invasion. Seeing the present temper of the Cape Government, he would like to know if such compensation was not given by the Cape Government, how it would be paid.

MR. LABOUCHERE said he desired to know if his hon. friend was in order, because it was stated in the debate that ultimately they would have to assume this responsibility.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said the Colonial Secretary stated yesterday that these notes would be regarded as evidence.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not understand the hon. Member's point of order. He is asking whether a certain item is to be included in this £3,000,000.

MR. LABOUCHERE thought the hon. Member opposite alluded to a statement made by the Colonial Secretary that the indemnity to the loyalists at the Cape was not included in this Vote, but that ultimately this country would have to assume the responsibility for that indemnity.

*MR. KEMP said he simply wanted to know if compensation was not given by the Cape Government, whether compensation would be given to those loyalists out of the present Vote.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member can enter into that question now, because this Vote is for a particular purpose.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian) asked whether it was intended that the notes issued by the late Transvaal Government under Law No. 1 of 1900 to the amount of some £750,000 should be honoured. A Mr. Schalk Burger informed him the other day that when he left the conference they were distinctly under the impression that those notes were going to be honoured. There was no doubt that the Boer leaders would be considerably discredited if the obligations entered into at the time of peace were not carried out.

*MR. SPEAKER: This question does not arise. The Vote is one for money to supply necessaries for the resumption of their normal occupations, provided by Article 10 of the terms of surrender. Therefore I do not see how the question referred to by the hon. Member can arise.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK said he understood that the question of these notes came under Law No. 1 of 1900, and was referred to by the Colonial Secretary last night.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am simply looking at the matter as it appears upon the Paper, and I do not think that the question as to the liability of the Government for these notes is concerned in this Vote.

MR. LOUGH stated that these notes were mentioned in the terms of surrender, and this was a Vote to meet the requirements of the terms of peace.

*MR. SPEAKER: But it does not say that the £3,000,000, is for the purpose of enabling the Government to redeem liabilities which, it is alleged, have been incurred by them upon these documents.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: But it has reference to war losses.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said the Colonial Secretary stated yesterday that these notes would be regarded as evidence of losses, and that being so, he contended that they would come under this Vote of £2,000,000. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no."] The Colonial Secretary said he would not regard these notes as legal notes which could be sued upon, but as evidence of losses sustained by the burghers and losses which were to be compensated out of this Vote.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the Colonial Secretary stated that the Government proposed to pay these notes out of this Vote, then it will be in order.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK said he was under the impression that the Colonial Secretary had referred to these notes as evidence of war losses. He suggested that when the Colonial Secretary visited South Africa he should inquire into the question of these notes, as it was the cause of bitter discontent throughout the Transvaal. The right hon. Gentleman referred in his speech last night in glowing terms to the state of the Transvaal. He was afraid that when the right hon. Gentleman visited the Colony he would be disabused on that point. The tangle in which matters were there justified the visit of the right hon. Gentleman, in order to assist Lord Milner in bringing about a better state of things. Repatriation was sadly hanging fire. Only one-fifth of the people in the concentration camps had so far been repatriated, chiefly owing to the miserable railway system. As one who had opposed Lord Milner's policy in South Africa, he was glad to testify to the conscientious manner in which the noble Lord was now carrying through the difficult task he had in hand.

*MR. CHANNING said he represented a district in which there was a number of large firms interested in commerce both in Johannesburg and Pretoria. At the outbreak of the war these firms suffered heavy losses. They had declined to remain and carry on dealings with the Boer Government, and their stock had been confiscated. He wished to know how they stood with regard to this £2,000,000 for other persons. He wished for an explanation as to whether any of this £2,000,000 would be distributed amongst such firms as he had referred to. In regard to the general topic he heartily supported what fell from the Leader of the Opposition last night as to the advisability of treating all parties with absolute and transparent equality and justice in the distribution of these funds for putting South Africa on a working footing again.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) said he wanted some enlightenment upon one or two of the items on the Paper. Item No. 1 consisted of "free grants of" £3,000,000 for burghers, and item No. 2 was "grants of" £2,000,000 for other persons. Did that mean that the money granted under No. 2 item would be repaid, and if it did not mean that why was the word "free" omitted therein? He took the omission of the word "free" to be a clerical error, and that both amounts were "free grants." He hoped they would all vote this money, for if they could get South Africa happy by a gift of £5,000,000 and a loan of £3,000,000, they would be very fortunate. He looked upon this as a most important matter, for it was necessary that they should have South Africa in a happy state. In his opinion Africa was one of the richest countries under the sun. America was a prosperous country, but he thought Africa in the near future was likely to be more prosperous than America. He hoped they would vote this money and any other sum that was asked for for this purpose, because he believed that for every million pounds spent in South Africa now, they would save ten or twenty millions hereafter.

Resolution agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT—(5TH NOVEMBER).

Resolution reported—

"That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, the sum of £8,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (No. 2) BILL.

"To supply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1903, and to appropriate the further Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time tomorrow.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 35, to leave out sub-Section (*b*).—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'for the' stand part of the Clause."

(9.55.) MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) said he supported the Amendment on various grounds, but mainly because the Section was vague and meaningless, and would, if it stood part of the Bill, lead to endless friction and dispute. The hon. Member for North West Ham had said that the Clause was very clear. It seemed to be clear in one respect only, and that was that the direct representatives of the ratepayers would be compelled, at the dictation of outside bodies, who were not described, to accept for the educational committees gentlemen who were suggested by the outside bodies. The sub-Clause was a compulsory one. As he read it, it gave to the Council no option, because it said that the scheme "shall provide" for the appointment by the Council, on the nomination, where it appeared desirable, of other bodies, of persons of experience in education. He should like to know from the First Lord or the Attorney General who those other bodies were. For anything he knew, when those words came to be interpreted they might mean religious bodies. They had no guarantee now that the other bodies would not be religious or political bodies. He should like also to know what was meant by the "needs of the various kinds of schools in the area for which the Council acts." Were they financial needs or the needs for larger accommodation for the scholars. It seemed to him that it was one of the vaguest of the many vague Clauses in a very vague Bill.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it appeared to him that hon. Members opposite were trying either to misunderstand or to misrepresent this Clause. It was really very simple in its character, and it was designed to give the education authority the best advice it could get. He was never quite sure whether, when hon. Gentlemen opposite professed ignorance of the objects of a particular Clause, it was that they did not know or did not want to know what the Clause really meant. Generally speaking, the purpose of this Clause was not by any means to import sectarian influences or interests into the Education Committee or the local education authority, but to secure that every educational interest in the area was represented. The appointment in every case was by the Council. In certain cases the Council might think it desirable to invite certain educational bodies or societies within the area to nominate members. Such bodies, for example, as the governing body of the High School for Girls, the Ladies' Training College, or the local societies for the higher education of women might be suitable bodies to be invited to nominate persons to take their place on the Education Committee. These persons would be nominated by the societies invited, if they were willing to make a nomination, and if the persons so nominated would be appointed by the local education authority. It was hardly possible to conceive, when a County Council invited the governing bodies mentioned or others to nominate some one to represent their educational interests, that they would be guilty of the discourtesy of refusing to appoint them. Still, in the last resort, the County Council would have the right to say, "Your particular nominee is so wholly unsuitable, unclubbable, or uneducational, that we must ask you to nominate someone else or give it up."

Mr. BRYCE asked for an explanation as to the position of the Board of Education in the matter.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that of course the scheme would come before the Board of Education, and surely it was the business of the Board to have regard to any representation which might be made to them by other bodies which thought they ought to have been invited to nominate representatives. Under those circumstances it would be the duty of the Board of Education to inquire whether they should be represented, and if the Board thought them worthy of being represented, they would suggest to the local authority to consider whether they ought to be invited to nominate representatives. The local authority might say that those bodies were already adequately represented. Surely there was nothing improper or derogatory to the local education authority in saying that persons or bodies who were left out and thought themselves aggrieved should be able to state their case to the Board, that the Board should be able to put their case to the local education authority, and that the matter should be discussed and finally arranged by conference between the Board of Education and the local education authority. Unless hon. Gentlemen opposite supposed that the whole object of the Board of Education was in some way to put a slight on the local education authority, he could not conceive what complaint there could be against bringing the influence of the Board to bear on the subject. It would require all the good temper, ingenuity, and experience, both of the local education authority and the Board of Education, to get this Bill into working order. So much for the "other bodies." He hoped the term had been explained, and that the process of nomination had been explained, if not to the satisfaction, at any rate to the intelligence of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Surely again it was no disparagement to the local education authority that they should be invited to look out for "persons of experience in education" who might be within the area, and who might not be persons on the governing bodies or within the sphere of nomination of the societies he had named, but who would, nevertheless, be able to give valuable assistance to the Education Committee in the carrying out of its functions. Persons of experience were to be found in almost every area, and might very well be invited to take part in the work of the Education Committee. It would be the business of the local education authority to look out for such persons, and the Board of Education might be able to assist the local education authority in calling attention to such persons. Then there were the persons acquainted with the needs of the different kinds of schools. There were many persons interested in education, and especially the administrative part of it. It was desirable to have persons on the governing body who had taken part in the management of committees for technical instruction, and who should be asked to take part in the work of Education Committees. This was another type of the persons who should be invited by the local education authority; and this Clause indicated the way in which substantial assistance could be given by all sorts of people outside the principal body, and who ought to be on its Education Committee. The object of the Bill was to provide that the majority of the Education Committee should be members of the County Council, but the County Council might not be able to produce the persons either representative of educational societies or of practical experience of education, or actively engaged in the management or government of schools. But this Clause reminded the local education authority that these were the persons whom it ought to place on its Education Committee; and the persons of this class would be of real assistance to the local education authority in the discharge of their functions. Whether they were the interests of particular sectarian schools, and he frankly admitted that sectarian interests might require to be taken into consideration, or whether they were the general interests of education, he was confident that those interests would be loyally borne in mind, and the best help would be given to the local education authority which the Committee could give.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he had listened to the very clear exposition by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, of what the functions of the Education Committee were to be. The more he had listened to the speech of the hon. Member the more confused he found the plan of the Government, and the greater the friction that was likely to arise. What was the definition of bodies? He thought that if the Government had said "souls" it would have been appropriate, but it would be better, in his opinion, to have societies, which were not the same thing as bodies. "Educational bodies" could be understood, but he pictured the case of a dissatisfied body, rejected by the County Council, who went to the Education Department. The education authorities might propose, but the Education Department disposed, and the practical working of the Government plan was this, that the education authority might reject the bodies who desired to be invited, and then a reference was made to the Education Department whether or not a particular body ought to be invited. Therefore there would be three conflicting bodies—first of all, the education authority which did not invite the body that desired to be invited, and the Board of Education, to which the question was referred whether that body ought to be invited or not. The hon. Member had very frankly said that these might be sectarian bodies. They knew very well what sectarian bodies were. If a sectarian body claimed to have seats on the committee, and the Education Department were appealed to, the Secretary might refuse to approve the scheme unless this sectarian body were represented on the committee. This would be an extremely disagreeable situation for the education authority to be placed in. The committee would have to be renominated every year, at all events every two or three years, and sectarian controversialists might be forced on the Education Committee. He could not conceive anything more disastrous to education than the rival claims of those bodies. Take the word "society." He did not know whether they would call a University a "society." He should hardly think that the representative of Oxford University would call it a society.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: It is a learned body.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Is that so in a statutory sense?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: A body corporate.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Very well. Did they propose to put a body corporate on the committee? They must come to some definition and form some idea as to what was to be the limitation of this Education Committee. They were throwing open to competition every form of society, or congregation, or sect to come forward and make their claim to seats on this committee, and then, when the education authority wished to have none of them, they might appeal to the Education Department, and that Department might refuse to approve the scheme unless this sectarian body were represented on the committee. He was afraid he might be open to the charge of re-iteration, but he maintained that this was another illustration of the manner in which the Government failed to trust their education authorities to do that which, if they were sensible people, they would certainly do, if allowed to look after it themselves. To impose upon them this bondage, with the accompanying disputes and turbulence which would be created by such a state of things, was most undesirable. It would be one of the things which would give these municipal bodies a distaste of having all these liabilities on their shoulders. It should be the endeavour of the Government to persuade these municipal bodies that their task was a comparatively light one. Why should they not suppose that these authorities would have the intelligence, without the directions which were proposed, to look out for so much or so little assistance as they thought they required? [Cries of "Divide."]

*(10.25.) MR. WALTER PALMER (Salisbury) said he believed he was one of many on that side of the House who had refrained from taking any part in these discussions, for one very simple reason, viz., that they did not wish by talking to delay for one single minute the more rapid passing of this measure, but he thought that on this very vital point undue silence might be wrongly construed. Sub-Section (*b*), he maintained, was one of the most vital points in the Bill, because it raised the whole principle of co-optation. He thought it would have been more generous on the part of the right hon. Gentleman opposite if, instead of going into the minute details as he had done, he had plainly stated whether he was, or was not, in favour of co-optation.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he would answer the question at once. He believed in co-optation at the discretion of the Council. Let the Council choose to get such assistance as they thought most appropriate.

*MR. WALTER PALMER said that there were one or two reasons why he thought it extremely necessary that they should adopt this extremely important principle of co-optation which underlay this sub-Section. In the remarks made hitherto the question of secondary education, which he considered the most important part of this measure, had been entirely lost sight of. He knew something of how the money under the Local Taxation Account Act of 1890 was distributed by the County Council, and he knew of instances in which a large proportion of the money was given to certain institutions. He could give one instance from the district with which he was particularly acquainted. In that district the sum of £1,600 was received from the local taxation account, and of that amount £1,100 was given to one institution of which he happened to be chairman. This institution was connected with the Municipal Council, and they expected to be represented on the Education Committee. He thought the distribution of this money might be taken as a criterion of the future action of the County Councils. It was of supreme importance that these various institutions should have a fair representation on the Education Committee, because, after all, the whole success of elementary education, as well as of secondary, depended upon the training of the teachers. Therefore, the bodies engaged in training teachers should be represented on the committee. He should like to suggest to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education that the word "nomination" was too strong, and might be modified to "representation." It was absolutely impossible to introduce any words which would limit the County Council from accepting nominations from religious or sectarian bodies. It was playing with the matter to talk of this sub-Section as vague and unmeaning, because it was one of the most important parts of the Bill, inasmuch as it introduced the principle of co-optation.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said that the Secretary to the Board of Education had made a very serious charge against that side of the House in alleging that they were attempting to misunderstand or misrepresent the Bill. Now, in regard to misunderstanding, it had taken the hon. Gentleman a quarter of an hour to say what this particular section meant, and he trusted that they, on that side of the House, might be forgiven if it took them a little time to understand it. The point between them was very simple. As the Bill now stood the committee must consist entirely of outsiders; there need not be a single member of the County Council on the committee; but it could not possibly consist entirely of insiders. All they asked was that it should be a genuine co-optation by the County Council. The Secretary to the Board of Education said that the appointment by the Council would be formal. If so, where would the real appointment come in?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the appointment would be formal in the sense that as soon as the education authority invited a society to send a representative to the Education Committee, the circumstances would be most exceptional under which it would be necessary for the Council to refuse to accept the nomination.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said that it seemed to be not enough to trust the people, or to give them experts on the committee, but by this sub-Section they were to have representatives of different societies who would thus acquire a *locus standi* at the Board of Education. He submitted that under this scheme of the Government they would have interminable strife. He did not believe in tying the hands of the County Council behind its back. He would trust the County Council to select the best men under the circumstances. He would be satisfied with co-optation depending on the free will of the County Councils, but not a spurious co-optation.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): said he asked the Secretary to the Education Department whether he would accept the word "representative" before "bodies" in the second line of the sub-Section? That would be much more satisfactory than having retired schoolmasters or retired military officers on the committee. "Representative bodies" would include representatives from friendly societies, trade unions, trades councils, and, as a counteraction to the head masters, they might also get representatives from the Poor Law Guardians, and the licensing authorities. (Cries of "Divide.") This was a very serious matter; surely he might make a suggestion. He did not wish to interfere with the progress of the Government; in fact he was coming to their help in this matter. It was a notorious fact that elementary education had been most successfully conducted in this country by persons who, previous to School Board management, had had no experience in education. School Board schools were infinitely superior in every respect to those which had been managed by experts. In fact there had been an entire failure of the expert. The expert was usually a fraud, and a snare into the bargain. In 1898 the right hon. the Member for Cambridge University said that the educational-experienced person was generally an utter failure in elementary education.

SIR JOHN GORST: I am not conscious that I ever said that, or anything approaching that.

MR. BROADHURST said that if the Committee would adjourn for a sufficient time to enable him to go to the library to look up the quotation he would find it. (Cries of "Divide.") He wanted to point out to the Secretary to the Board of Education that popular education would be facilitated if representative public bodies were represented on the Committee.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said that if the right hon. Gentleman intended that the Council should ultimately have absolute discretion as regarded the denominational bodies to be invited-would he allow words to be introduced into the Clause to make that interpretation clear? In that case their objection would be met. He highly approved of the interpretation which the hon. Gentleman, the Secretary to the Board of Education, had given, but he was sadly afraid that it was not an accurate interpretation, and that it would be possible, under the Clause as it stood, for a scheme to be framed, in the last resort, by the Board of Education, and that the County Council would be obliged to appoint whoever was nominated by the denominational bodies. It might be that the hon. Gentleman did not intend that, but he maintained that such a scheme would be legal if made by the Board of Education. The words were that the County Council should invite particular bodies to nominate persons to represent their interests; and then it was provided that the County Council "shall,"—not "may,"—appoint such persons. He did not say that the Board of Education would frame such a scheme, but he did say that they could frame such a scheme. If, however, the words "at the discretion of" were introduced they would show clearly that the interpretation given by the hon. Gentleman was correct.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said he would appeal to his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said as he understood that it would be for the convenience of the Committee that the issue should be taken on a subsequent Amendment, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said, before the Amendment was withdrawn, it should be clearly understood that an opportunity would be given for discussing the point on another Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was nothing to preclude the discussion of the point on a later Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said he proposed to move the words "selection and" before "appointment." The object of the Amendment was to make co-optation entirely a matter for the County Council. sub-Section (*a*) dealt with the selection and appointment by the Council of at least a majority of the Committee; and sub-Section (*b*) proposed to include persons who had experience of education, but who were not members of the Council. The Amendment he proposed, which followed the language of sub-Section (*a*), was that the selection should be entirely in the hands of the Council. If he understood rightly the sense of the Committee, it was that the Council should be the determining authority as to the persons to be co-opted, and that was his sole point in moving his Amendment. He did not think that there could be any serious doubt in the mind of any member of the Committee that that was the true principle to be established.

Amendment proposed:—

"In page 4, line 35, after the first word 'the' to insert the words 'selection and.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it was quite impossible to accept the Amendment. He did not know if the hon. Gentleman quite realised its effect. He

was about to have said on the last Amendment, in answer to an hon. Member who asked him whether the actual appointment would be by the Council, that he had no doubt whatever that the Council would appoint the person nominated. He had said over and over again that when the Council had invited some society to nominate a person, it would find very great difficulty in not accepting that nomination. But the Council would only select a body which it was desirable should be selected, and consequently would presumably be prepared to accept its nominee; but they could not ask that society to send them samples of its members. Take a case which was very familiar to himself. He had been a member of the Council of the University of Oxford for a number of years, and that Council was constantly asked to nominate a member of the governing body of some community; but it was never asked to send to the body which invited the nomination three or four names to select from. He thought that the Council of any University would decline to nominate at all under such conditions; and it would reduce this nomination by a society to a perfect farce if they were asked to send groups of names for the Municipal Council to make a selection from. The appointment would be with the Council, and the Council would have the choice of the bodies to be invited to nominate.

MR. BRYCE said he did not quite understand yet what was contemplated by the hon. Gentleman when he spoke of the Council having the right to invite these bodies. As he understood it, the Council would have no choice. The scheme would fix the bodies who were to nominate, and on their nomination the Council should appoint. For instance, a girls' training college might be entitled to nominate a person to serve on the committee. The Council would have no choice in the matter whatever, but must appoint the person nominated by the college. That was the meaning of the Clause, as he understood it. All the Council had to do was to go through the purely mechanical function of making the appointment on the nomination of another body. That was not a choice in any sense of the word.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had overlooked the fact that these sub-Clauses were instructions for the composition of a scheme. The scheme would be the scheme of the Council, it would be made by the Council, and would be approved by the Board of Education. In making that scheme, the Council looked over its area, and selected certain bodies which it thought desirable to invite to nominate representatives on the Committee. Once these bodies were in the scheme, they would continue to make nominations in accordance with the scheme until it was altered, and the Council would appoint their nominees. Most distinctly, the choice of the society rested with the Council in the first instance. The nomination would rest with the bodies that would be invited, and the appointment would rest with the Council.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked what would be the action of the Board of Education if the Council did not appoint anybody under this Section, or selected from bodies of which the Board did not approve.

(11.0.) MR. ERNEST GRAY said he regarded the Clause as one of the best that could be designed to secure the object of the framers of the Bill, namely, the co-ordination of all forms of education. He would take the case of the county borough with which he was best acquainted—that of West Ham. There, they had three institutions, one controlled by the Council itself, one by a great city company, and one by the directors of the Great Eastern Railway. Overlapping was almost inevitable; and it was obvious, if money was not to be wasted, and if good educational work were to be done, that these three institutions should be brought into line, and that, under the Bill, they should be represented on the Education Committee. The proposal before the Committee was that the Council itself should pick out the persons to represent these institutions on the Education Committee. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No."] What was the meaning of the Amendment if it was not that?

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said that the object of his Amendment was that the other bodies should be consulted, but that the Council should make its own selection.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said that in the illustration he had given earlier in the evening he said that the County Council of Hertford did exactly what the Bill proposed. It asked the teachers of the county to nominate two persons; and that was what the Bill proposed. [HON. MEMBERS: "No, no."] It was only a question of explaining the King's English. The Bill proposed that the Council should set forth in its scheme the various bodies it proposed to invite to nominate representatives to serve on the Committee. He had seen the system in operation. The County Council of Hertford asked the teachers to nominate; they did nominate; and their nominees were appointed. That was the meaning of the Clause. Unless the societies were asked to make the nomination, how could they get fit and proper persons to represent them? If a great educational organisation were to be represented on the committee, it was absolutely essential that the person chosen should possess the confidence of his colleagues. How could that be guaranteed unless he were chosen by them? Take the great institutions to which he had referred, which were doing most excellent work, and which had fitted up some of the best laboratories in the East End. How could it be guaranteed that the persons selected to represent these institutions possessed the confidence of their colleagues, knew the character of the work that was being carried on, and would be able to co-ordinate that work with other work in the district, unless they were selected by the persons whom they were to represent? The whole object of the Clause was to give bodies of that description power to pick out from among their governors the best fitted and most experienced person to represent them on the Committee, men who would know what money was needed, how it should be expended, what were the capabilities of their own organisation, and how much they could bring to the common purse in educational effort and hard cash, towards the co-ordination of every bit of educational work in their area. That was the object of the Clause, and he earnestly hoped that not merely the Government, but the Committee as a whole, would shut out from their minds the idea that the Clause was an attempt to bring in sectarian organisations. The scheme of the Bill was the scheme which for years past had been in operation in the great town of Zurich. Those who knew anything of the Swiss educational system would know that the scheme there was almost identical with the scheme of the Bill. Certain organisations within the town of Zurich were not merely invited, but were compelled, on given days, to select representatives; the names were submitted to the Town Council who appointed them; and the forces of the common-sense of the County Council, and the expert knowledge of the scientists selected, were brought together, with the result that the most democratic, probably the most socialistic, town in Europe, had one of the highest forms of education to be found on the Continent. It was time that we took a leaf out of the book of our Continental competitors, and, profiting by their experience, adopt a form of educational government which had done so much good for them, and which might be equally good for this country. He sincerely hoped that England would in future have a combination of common sense and expert knowledge to carry on the work of education; but he failed to see how it could be obtained except in the most praiseworthy scheme of the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not think that the hon. Member who had just spoken quite apprehended the objections which had been raised to the Clause. Their objection was that the power of selection was not given to the Council.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY said neither was it in Zurich.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he relied on the reports of the Education Department. If the hon. Gentleman said that in Zurich the Town Council had no right to select the bodies who were to nominate he said the hon. Member was wrong. If the Swiss Federal Government said,

"You have to select men to govern education in the town of Zurich from certain bodies we indicate," then the case would be analogous. All they asked for was that the great towns of England and Wales should have the same liberty that the hon. Gentleman approved of in Zurich. It was a great educational system in Zurich; but the hon. Member could not tolerate it in England and Wales. At any rate, let the hon. Member not quote Zurich, because Zurich was the Amendment of his hon. friend. Zurich selected its own bodies, but did the hon. Member mean to say that the County Council of Yorkshire, for instance, could select its own bodies? Suppose the Education Department said to the County Council of Yorkshire—"You have to elect representatives of other bodies, but we do not find them in the scheme you have provided." The Attorney General mentioned who these bodies would be — the Wesleyans, the Roman Catholics, and, lastly, the Church of England, because he supposed it was last in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman. Suppose the Education Department said to the County Council, "We do not find that the Wesleyans, the Roman Catholics, or the Church of England have got a representative under your scheme." Did the hon. Member mean to say that in that case the Board of Education could not oppose that scheme?

Mr. ERNEST GRAY: Yes, I say so.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if the interpretation of the hon. Member was correct, he should support the Amendment of his hon. friend. Suppose the County Council of Glamorgan did not put on the Committee as many representatives of the denominational schools as the Board of Education thought satisfied the requirements of the case, and that the Board of Education wrote to the Council saying, "We decline to sanction your scheme until you put on further representatives of the denominational schools"——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Every scheme has, of course, to be approved by the Board of Education.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that, of course, the Education Department might also reject a scheme. Unfortunately, the hon. Member opposite would not be the authority to decide on these schemes. It would be the Government that would interpret the Clause, not even the Court of Appeal. Moreover, under Section 5, if a scheme had not been made and approved within twelve months, the Education Department could make a scheme of its own.

MR. ERNEST GRAY: Subject to the approval of the House of Commons.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Education Bill showed what the House of Commons might approve. What he wanted to know from the hon. Member was what became of the Zurich analogy and the Zurich independence in the Bill now. But the hon. Gentleman should not really drop Zurich, as it was very useful. The hon. Member, who had studied the matter very closely, who was more fully acquainted with the provisions of the Bill than any unofficial Member on the other side, who was an expert, the sort of man they wanted to bring in under sub-Section (*b*), who had studied educational systems, not only in this country but in Zurich, was absolutely in conflict with his own leaders as to the meaning of the Bill. How could ordinary laymen on a County Council, even with the aid of experts, interpret the Bill when experts in the House of Commons disagreed as to its meaning. The hon. Member said that the Committee should dismiss from its mind altogether the notion that the Clause was a plot in order to bring in the voluntary schools. That certainly was not their notion. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen asked the Attorney General to tell the Committee what these other bodies were. The Attorney General said that they were bodies interested in education, and, with that reluctance of his race, he said at last that they would be Wesleyans, Roman Catholics, and Anglicans. That was not their notion; and he wished to know why the hon. Gentleman opposite should point the finger of scorn at them, and say they had a certain idea when the idea belonged to the Attorney General. They wanted to know who these bodies were, and whether the County Council was to have the right of selection. Co-optation, which was forced, was no option. A great deal had been said about the Welsh Intermediate scheme. In that scheme, there were provisions for the representation of the School Boards. What did that mean? It meant that the local ratepayers would be represented. There was no provision in the present Bill for the protection of the local ratepayers, or for the protection of the parent, and the only persons who were mentioned were members of bodies acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools. Who were they? They were the denominational managers. There was nothing in the Bill to compel the Council to introduce into the scheme representatives of the District Councils or the Parish Councils, although a District Council might represent 10,000 ratepayers; but where four managers were concerned, special words were introduced in order to protect them. Who did they represent? They did not represent the ratepayer. They did not even represent their own denomination. They were not elected by that denomination; they were simply nominated either by the landowner or the local clergyman; and yet these four persons were to have the right of representation on the committee, whereas no words were introduced to secure representation for the Parish Councils and District Councils. He thought that was a very fair indication of the spirit in which the Bill was drawn. In fact, one could not take up a single section in the Bill without finding a provision for the protection of voluntary schools. There was the majority management of two to one; the appointment of teachers; the appeal to the Board of Education and the time which could be consumed; and, as if these things were not enough, they were also to have representation on the committee, although they were not responsible to any one, not even to the denomination they were supposed to represent.

*MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said he did not know if it was too late to recall the Committee to the particular Amendment under discussion. They had had a general discussion on the Motion to omit the Clause, and now they were having another general discussion. He gathered from the hon. Member who moved the Amendment that his object was to make clear what was already said to be clear, that the appointment of nominated members was to be in the hands of the Council. He did not, however, understand the difference between "selection" and "appointment." It had been indicated clearly by the Government that the Council would have a veto, as it were, on any such nomination as was contemplated in the Clause. He certainly understood that the appointment was to be in the hands of the County Council, and that the Council would not be obliged to accept any nomination from other bodies. He understood the hon. Gentlemen's object was to make that clear, and he admitted there might be some doubt about it. He therefore ventured to make a suggestion which he thought might meet with the approval of many hon. Members on both sides. He thought the word "nomination" was a somewhat unsuitable word, and he proposed to substitute for it the word "recommendation," in order to make it clear that the Council would be ultimately responsible for the appointment. The word "nomination" was generally used where the body who nominated had the absolute right to elect its nominee. He himself happened to be nominated by the London County Council as one of the governors of a technical institution in London, and the other governors had no power to interfere with such nomination. He suggested that what was proposed was really in the nature of a recommendation to the Council from these bodies, the appointment being with the Council. He doubted whether the insertion of the words "selection of" would alter the sense of the Clause, because he saw very little difference between "selection" and "appointment." It would be quite impossible to ask a body to send up a row of nominees, giving the County Council the right to select one of them, and he could not imagine that the hon. Member had any such idea in his mind.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said he intended to propose a consequential Amendment which would make his meaning perfectly clear.

*Mr. BOUSFIELD said he thought that the Amendment would introduce confusion, whereas the object the hon. Gentleman had in view would be attained if the word "recommendation" were substituted for "nomination." It would then be quite clear that the final appointment would be with the Council.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he wished to recommend to hon. Members that they should confine themselves to the issue before the Committee, and not go into drafting points. He quite agreed that drafting was not very easy, and he had no doubt that they might argue over words for a very long time. As to the actual point at issue, it would be left absolutely to the County Council or the Borough Council, as the case might be, to decide, without restriction or interference in any shape or form, what bodies should be invited. He did not, however, rise to argue the point, but to suggest that the Committee might decide that important issue now without going off into the *minutiæ* of drafting refinements.

Mr. ROBSON said that the speech of the Secretary to the Board of Education disclosed a singular misapprehension on his part as to the meaning of the Clause; and that, not in reference to drafting *minutiæ* which the Prime Minister had recommended the Committee not to discuss, but with reference to a matter of substance. The Secretary to the Board of Education said that the Council would have the power of appointing persons nominated by unknown bodies, and he went on to say that if the Council did not like a particular person who was nominated, it would be entitled to refuse to appoint him, and that the body concerned would be obliged to nominate another person. If the hon. Gentleman would consult the Attorney General, he would find that that was not the meaning of the Clause. The Clause was as imperative as any Clause could be. It was that the scheme "shall provide" for the appointment by the Council on the nomination of other bodies. That meant that the Council must appoint the persons nominated by the other bodies. If it were really the intention of the Government that the Council should have power to refuse nomination, then they should have it clearly stated in the Clause, in which case his hon. friend's Amendment would not be necessary. If it were intended that the Council should be entitled to say to anybody "Your nominee is not a *persona grata* to us, and we refuse to accept him," words should be inserted giving the Council the power of selection as well as of nomination, because that was what it amounted to. If the Secretary to the Board of Education were right, the Council had the power of selection or, at all events, the power of veto, but that was not in the Clause as it stood.

*(11.30.) SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he trusted that the Committee would give consideration to a word from him, as he was not a novice on that part of the question. The proposal of the Government to provide for nomination by other bodies was only adopting in an Act of Parliament a practice which had obtained with the Charity Commissioners and the Board of Education successively for more than thirty years. He had taken a note of the bodies who had nominated to the Technical Instruction Committee in his own experience. They were the College of St. John's (Cambridge), Victoria University, Owen's College (Manchester), the Yorkshire College (Leeds), and also institutions of a more local character, such as the Technical Colleges, Grammar Schools, and so on through a long series. All experience of the working of the system showed hi that [infinite good resulted from it. The members nominated by the Victoria Univerity, Owen's College, and the Yorkshire College, were gentlemen of culture with a knowledge of educational subjects and thoroughly familiar with the needs of the various schools. Therefore, they were now simply placing on the Statute Book a practice which had been adopted by the central department in connection with secondary education for more than a generation, with eminent and conspicuous success. He did not wish to quibble on a question of language, but the word "nomination" was almost universally adopted already; and with regard to the scheme itself, he would remind the Committee that the Council, in the first instance, would submit it, and that they would also have the power of proposing alterations from time to time. From his own observation he thought it was most desirable that other bodies should be brought in. The report of the Commission on Secondary Education also recommended that plan, and, therefore, he was justified in the statement that if the proposal were adopted it would, without doubt, be most successful.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) pointed out that every well regulated County Council had its committee of selection, just as had the House of Commons, and if the consequential Amendment of his hon. friend were carried it would be open to that Committee of Selection to communicate with the governing bodies of schools or other bodies which it might think proper to consult, and obtain from them the names of gentlemen whom they might wish to see on the Education Committee. That would be a much more convenient course than that of giving statutory sanction to a scheme, because a scheme once approved would stand hard and fast until repealed and another substituted, whereas it would be in the power of the Committee of Selection, if they thought fit, at every election to vary the authorities from which they choose their experts, according to the varying importance of those bodies. That would be a much more convenient plan, and it would not in any way diminish the advantage of obtaining outside advice.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) asked whether the Board of Education was to have power to order the appointment of the persons nominated by outside bodies. If a scheme could not be approved without such nominations it followed that the appointment of certain members from outside would be absolutely necessary on the part of the Council before they could carry on their work. If, however, the Council had the power to select the bodies, in the first instance, from whom the appointments were to be made, much of the objection to the proposal would be removed. Under the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, the Council had powers of co-optation which had been freely exercised without any hitch whatever, and he could not see why a power which had been exercised with great discretion and wisdom should be interfered with.

(11.38) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 92; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 482.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown,George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.

Sir Brampton Gurdon.

Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.

Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry

Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J G (Oxford Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(11.51) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the first word "of," inclusive, in page 4, line 36, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the first word "of," inclusive, in page 4, line 36, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 483.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford Lord Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick, N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir. Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston

Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Tkomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Thomas,JA (Glam'rgan,Gower
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George(York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R)
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone
and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(11.59.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 190; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 484.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour,Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Gibbs,Hn. A. G. H. (CityofLond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary(St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard(Hanley
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,F'versham
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.)Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell,W.JH(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts,
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Fras. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Dvd. Brynmor (Swansea
Labouchere, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jsph. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

It being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time Tomorrow.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [LORDS.]

Considered in Committee, and reported, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 7th November, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Herbert Louis Samuel, esquire, for North Riding of Yorkshire (Cleveland Division.)

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petition from Wednesbury, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Wednesbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Enfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petition from Wednesbury, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SITE VALUES (INSANITARY AREAS).

Petition from St. Pancras, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION.

Return [presented 31st October] to be printed. [No. 367.]

FISHING PIERS (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July; *Sir Thomas Esmonde*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No 368.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Royal Parks—Concessions to Local Authorities—Bushey Park.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he is aware that endeavours have been made by local authorities and others to obtain concessions of portions of the parks around London which have been refused; whether he is aware of the condition of the road along the side of Bushey Park which has been made over to the London United Tramways Company; and whether the exchange which has been effected by the Office of Works of a portion of Bushey Park against the land given by the London United Tramways Company is of equal value to that of the amount of land necessary for the London United Tramways Company to buy in order to lay down a tramway without danger to the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) The First Commissioner is not aware that concessions of portions of Royal Parks around London have been refused to local authorities when it has been established that such concessions were necessary in the public interest and for the public safety, but concessions have been refused to private individuals. The road along the side of Bushey Park is under the control of the local authority, and the First Commissioner is in no way responsible for the condition thereof. No exchange of land has been effected by the First Commissioner with the United Tramways Company; the use of the strip of land to be added to the road by setting back the park fence will be handed over to the local authority.

India—Cultivated and Waste Lands Statistics, 1880–1902.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state approximately the number of acres of land in each province of India which were under cultivation in 1880 and are now lying waste.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I am unable to give the hon. Member the information asked for, as the agricultural statistics of the several provinces do not show the lands which were cultivated in 1880 and are now uncultivated.

Rupee Coinage, Gold Reserve, etc.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the number of rupees coined during the financial year 1901–02, the net profit derived therefrom, and the amount of the gold reserve fund which not long since was established in connection with the currency system of India.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord G. Hamilton.*) The number of rupees coined in 1901–02, including old rupees recoined, was 495,20,460. The profit that accrued to the gold reserve fund during the year was £415,100. The gold reserve fund now consists of £3,738,000 Consols in England and £175,000 gold in India.

Indian Currency—Closing of Mints in Native States.

SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, concurrently with closing the mints in British India to the free coinage of silver in 1893, the mints of all, or any, of the native states were then or subsequently closed; and, if so, will he say in which States the mints have been so closed.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord G. Hamilton.*) Since 1893 the following native states in India have closed their mints and abandoned their local silver currencies in favour of the Government of India's rupee:—1894, Dewas States; 1895, certain states in Bhopowar Agency, and Western Malwa Agency; 1896, Palanpur; 1897, Bhopal and lesser neighbouring states; Kashmir; 1900, Radhanpur; Nawanagar; Jodhpur; Baroda; 1901, Jhalawar and Kota; 1902, Indore.

Expenses of Indian Guests and Troops at the Coronation.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the charges incurred in connection with the official Indian visitors in this country for the Coronation, whether the British Exchequer is to pay only charges in respect of the representatives of the Presidency towns and the Provinces; whether the British Exchequer will defrar any, and, if so, what charges in respect of visitors who were Indian princes or chiefs; and who will defray the expenses of the Indian military contingent, of transport of the troops to this country and back to India, and of the reception held at the India Office on 4th July respectively.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord G. Hamilton.*) The Treasury has undertaken to bear the whole of the expenditure incurred in this country on account of the visit of Indian princes, delegates, and troops on the occasion of the Coronation, including the cost of the reception at the India Office; but, in accordance with the course followed in the case of Colonial visitors, all transport charges will be borne by India.

Indian Budget—Notation Employed in Explanatory Memorandums.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for India if it is due to the altered significance of the symbol £, as used during the last two years, that while in the Explanatory Memorandum of the Indian Budget for 1899–1900 the capital liabilities of the Government of India exceeded the assets by £53,029,000, in the present year the assets exceed liabilities by only £1,240,000; if not will he explain to what is the reduction due.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord G. Hamilton.*) I understand the hon. Member to suggest that in the Explanatory Memorandum published in 1899, it was stated that the liabilities of the Government of India exceeded their assets by £53,029,000. This suggestion is erroneous. On page 25 of the Memorandum in question the balance of assets and liabilities was shown as follows: Excess of assets over liabilities in India, Rx.32,010,000; excess of liabilities over assets in England, £53,029,000. Converting the Indian figures at the rate of 15 rupees to the pound, the excess of liabilities over assets in both countries on the 31st of March, 1899, is thus £31,689,000, or £21,340,000 less than the figures given by the hon. Member. The improvement shown in the statement for the present year is not due to the change in the form of accounts. The chief items contributing to it (besides the normal growth in the value of railway and irrigation works due to expenditure on construction beyond the amount provided by borrowing) are the acquisition of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway by the creation of annuities, according to the system explained in the footnote to the statement, and at greater length on page 10 of the Explanatory Memorandum of July, 1901, the creation of a Gold Reserve Fund from the profits on coinage, the increase in the loans made by the Government of India from their balances to corporations and Native States, and the increase in the cash balances in India and England.

London Water Bill—Remuneration to proposed Commissioners.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can now state, or before Clause 23 of the London Water Bill is reached he will promulgate information showing, the amount and nature of the remuneration to be assigned to each of the Commissioners by the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I gave careful consideration to this matter before the Bill was introduced; but I felt then, and still feel, that it is impossible to determine the amount of the remuneration to be paid to the Commissioners until the extent of the duties which they will be called upon to perform is ascertained. For this reason I am unable to give the information desired by my hon. friend. I have satisfied myself, however, that no undue cost will be involved.

Army—Average Annual Cost of various Arms.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the approximate average annual cost of an infantry soldier of the line, a cavalry soldier, a militiaman, an Imperial yeoman, and a volunteer.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The average annual cost of a private of each of the arms mentioned is approximately as follows:—Infantry of the Line, £52 6s. 4d.; Cavalry of Line, £58 16s. 9d.; Militia (Infantry) £18 12s. 6d.; Imperial Yeomanry, £19 13s. 6d.; Volunteers, £6 0s. 0d. The cost of infantry and cavalry respectively after 1st April, 1904, when the increased pay takes effect, will be £59 6s. 1d. and £65 16s. 6d.

South Africa—War Losses Loan—Distribution.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the distribution of the two millions to persons other than burghers who have suffered losses because of the war, compensation will be given to those British firms who declined to remain in Johannesburg and Pretoria after the beginning of the war, to help the Boers by continuing to trade with them, and were in consequence exposed to losses by confiscation of stock-in-trade and otherwise.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The only limitation with regard to those who will be entitled to participate in the grant of £2,000,000 on proof of war losses, is that companies and large firms will be excluded, in accordance with the principle on which compensation has been awarded in Natal.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

(12.10.) SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) moved to include Rural District Councils specifically among the bodies which should nominate persons of experience in education to serve on the Education Committee. He said the Amendment was supported on both sides of the House. It was felt by the Rural District Councils that they were rather left out in the cold as compared with the Urban District Councils, and the noble Lord the Member for the Horncastle Division of Lincolnshire had, with himself, been requested to put this Amendment on the Paper by the Rural District Councils Association, a body which represented 200 Rural District Councils. If the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill could not now accept the Amendment, he hoped that at any rate he would promise it favourable consideration.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'Rural District Councils.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) declined to accept the Amendment, urging that it was better to leave the words perfectly general, so that the education authority might be at liberty to make its selection from any public or other body it might choose. If it should be thought desirable by a local authority to apply to the Rural District Council, it would be able to do so as the Bill now stood. If not, the Bill enabled the authority to have recourse to such other bodies as it judged desirable. He could not help thinking that the Amendment was an objectless Amendment, so far as extending the powers of local authorities was concerned. In addition, it was open to the objection that it inserted the name of one body, but did not enumerate the others. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed by the hon. Baronet.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said he felt very strongly that these local Education Committees should be as representative as possible, and he objected to this Amendment because he thought it would tend to limit the discretion of the local authority. One of the most important features of this Clause was that it gave the local authority the power of appointing the best committee it could obtain. In some cases, no doubt, the representatives of Rural District Councils would be desirable, but he thought those cases would not be very common, and he was in favour of leaving to the local authority the fullest discretion.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) suggested that the Amendment commanded the Council to perform an impossibility. How many Rural District Councils were there in the cities of Liverpool, Manchester, or Leeds? On the ground of number alone it would be impossible to give them all a representation on the Committee.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said that to his mind this was a most ridiculous Amendment. It was as he understood it a proposal that the Rural District Council should have the right of nominating a person to serve on the local Education Committee. The result would be that if the majority of the Education Committee were to be members of the County Council as was already provided by the Bill, and every rural district were to nominate a member of the minority, either there would be more persons with a right to sit on the committee than there would be seats available, or the County Council must undertake the invidious task of choosing between different District Councils. This would set up friction which would do incalculable injury both to education and local government. So far they had been careful to do nothing likely to cause friction between the supreme Council of the county and the Urban and Rural District Councils. Every effort had been made to secure that they should work harmoniously. This was the first note of friction, and it seemed to him that the Government had no alternative but to offer the Amendment the strongest possible opposition. Nothing worse could happen than that it should be carried.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said the Amendment showed extraordinary inconsistency on the part of the hon. Baronet who moved it. Members of the Rural District Councils were usually men who had great difficulty in finding time to discharge their public duties, and it was preposterous that the

County Council, when selecting experts to advise them in their educational work, should have to go to a body which was composed of neither educational experts nor leisured men, and the members of which would in consequence of the difficulty of having to go to the county town to attend meetings, abstain from putting in an appearance. He strongly opposed the Amendment.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) said he was much struck by the sudden cessation of talk on the part of the Opposition, after the Amendment had been moved. There must be surely something very remarkable in this unexpected silence. He felt sure the Opposition would not have been so anxious to divide so early had this Amendment been submitted from the Government side of the House. He did not in the least undervalue the work of Rural Councils, but it could not be said that the members of those bodies had much experience in educational work. The Clause, as it stood, gave ample power to the County Councils to select the men most fitted to divide them, and he had no doubt that among the Members of Education Committees would be found some who filled the position of Rural District Councillors.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) pointed out that if Rural District Councils were given the right to nominate representatives on the Education Committee an equally good claim might be advanced on behalf of the Urban District Councils and small boroughs, and if the rights of both kinds of bodies were conceded, the Education Committee would be filled by their representatives to the entire exclusion of other representatives of educational bodies who would be specially fitted to advise the County Councils in this important work entrusted to them. Therefore, while recognising the reasons for the Amendment, he was unable to vote for it.

(12.33.) Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 74; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 485.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Edward Strachey and
Mr. Thomas Bayley

NOES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carew, James Lawrence

Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Dorington, Rt.Hon. SirJohnE.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Gibbs,Hon. Vicary(St. Albans)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
MacIver David (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell,W.JH(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) moved to leave out "other bodies" and insert "educational institutions in or near the district not themselves subject to the control of the local education authority, such as universities, colleges of university rank, non-local schools, and local endowed schools." He said it would be observed that this Amendment dealt with the question of the representation of educational bodies in no sectarian or sectional spirit. If they were to have nominations from any bodies at all it was desirable to restrict them to such bodies as proceeded on broad national lines. He wished to point out that there were other bodies, such as trade unions and co-operative societies, which he had no desire to exclude. He wanted, in fact, to bring in bodies which sought to promote the general welfare of the whole body politic. He regretted that they had not on the previous day an opportunity of arriving at some compromise as to the form of nomination. What he was contending for in his Amendment was that the bodies which should contribute to the membership of the local committee should be bodies of an educational character as distinct from sectional or sectarian interests, and the Amendment was pressed upon him by those who were interested in higher education in Birmingham and the Midlands generally. The Government had intimated that the Board of Education would carefully weigh the claims of strictly sectarian bodies, and press those claims upon the County Councils. Now, one of the main objects of the Bill, as he understood it, was that it was to be a really educational measure, bringing all branches of education together; but the Board of Education, by pressing the claims of purely sectarian bodies on the County Councils, would be importing into the new educational machinery the very evil of sectarian strife and animosity which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, while in office, again and again protested against—the evil which resulted from the popular election of School Boards under the cumulative vote.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, to leave out the words 'other bodies,' and insert the words 'educational institutions in or near the district not themselves subject to the control of the local education authority, such as universities, colleges of university rank, non-local schools and local endowed schools.—(*Mr. Channing.*)' "

Question proposed, "That the word 'other' stand part of the Clause."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he imagined no one would object to the enumeration of the bodies which the hon. Member desired to see represented on the Education Committee. But he did not see on what principle of justice the hon. Gentleman desired to exclude any other institution, such as the Association of Voluntary Schools, from representation. They were going, rightly or wrongly, to place the denominational schools under the control of the education authority, and to insist that upon every board of management of the voluntary schools there should be a representative of the local education authority. Was it not common fairness that they should have, not a preponderating representation, nor even a numerically important representation, but at all events someone on the Education Committee through whom they might make their views heard? Although that was a perfectly sound view as regarded all denominational schools, probably it was of less real importance when they were dealing with Anglican schools, or even Wesleyan schools, than it was when they were dealing with Roman Catholic schools. There ought to be some one on the Education Committee to represent Roman Catholic schools in regard to any action the committee might take which specially affected those schools. To try to prevent that simple measure of fairness from being carried out by using such phrases as "sectarian" and "anti-national" was not very wise. He believed the Committee, except for the purpose of sectarian controversy, did not really desire such an exclusion, and he trusted the Amendment would be rejected.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) thought a strong case existed for the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had not given any reason why these sectarian associations should be represented on the Education Committee. No difficulty would arise in regard to the Roman Catholic schools, because, with some exceptions, those schools were only used by members of their own denomination. He could not conceive that anybody wanted to injure them or to deal unjustly by them. Yet their case was always trotted out in the front rank of the schools as to which difficulty was likely to arise. He protested against the use that was made of the Roman Catholic case.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought that the case was strongest in regard to the Roman Catholic schools; but there was a case with regard to the other schools.

MR. BRYCE said by Clause 8 they had subjected the denominational schools to the control of the local authority for all the purposes of secular instruction. Therefore, so far as secular instruction was concerned, the denominational schools were on a level with other schools. For the purposes of religious instruction the denominational schools were absolutely under the control of their own managers. No question could come before the Education Committee which involved religious instruction, and, therefore, so far as he could see, the *raison d'être* for the representation of these bodies on the committee entirely disappeared. The object of the Government was to give them a double control.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

MR. BRYCE said their managers were to have complete and absolute control over religious instruction, and yet religious instruction was the reason for giving them representation on the committee. It was an illustration of a familiar proverb—they wanted both to eat their cake and have it. He entirely failed to see the ground or justice of the right hon. Gentleman's demand. If the local education authority had been given any power to interfere with religious instruction, this claim to representation would have been well founded. But there was no such power, and the claim, therefore, fell to the ground. He saw no reason why any sectarian association should be given representation on the committee. Nothing could be worse for the good working of the committee than that certain persons should be put on it to be the champions of sectarianism. That would introduce into this new body an element of discord which need not be there at all, and it was a very bad omen for the working of the committee, for there could be nothing more likely to introduce the party element and the germ of discord than the adoption of such a policy.

(1.0.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Committee will allow me to say one word in reply to what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. He talks in the first place as if the allowing of a single representative of a Roman Catholic Voluntary School Association in the district to be on the committee is to give them a controlling voice, or something like a controlling voice. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] At all events an important voice in the management of the schools of the district. That I understood to be the right hon. Gentleman's argument. But it should be remembered that in respect of these very Roman Catholic schools you have put, not one out of forty-five or fifty, but two out of six, who are to represent the local education authority on the board of managers. If that is not interference with sectarian education, surely he might allow the whole body of Roman Catholic schools in a district to send one representative to the Education Committee in case something should arise which specially affects their interests. Other questions than religious education would be of interest to the denominational managers. The very preservation of these schools is not a question of religious teaching, but it is a question of the greatest interest of the denomination, and surely they might be allowed to make their voices heard if any policy is initiated which would have a destructive effect.

MR. BRYCE: But the Education Committee will have no policy. It will be the policy of the County Council.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Surely they might be allowed to explain or, at all events, to make their voice heard in the committee which is to advise the Council in these matters. But that is not all, although I think that would be enough. I think the fact that this Education Committee is to advise not only upon broad policy but upon other matters is a sufficient reason for giving these schools some way of making their voices heard. But there is more than that. Let the Committee remember what the right hon. Gentleman has asked. It is that the education authority shall have the right to veto the appointment of a teacher. The Education Committee have to advise on that point. Is it not fair and commonsense that at all events before so drastic a policy is pursued the voluntary schools concerned should have some methods of explaining their views? I do really think that if hon. Members would approach this question in a more impartial spirit than the right hon. Gentleman has done, they would not attempt to force on the House or into the Bill provisions which would be inequitable in working.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he did not think the Prime Minister had quite fairly stated the objection of his right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen. His right hon. friend had never objected to allowing a Roman Catholic to sit on the committee.

MR. BRYCE: I did not understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that I had done so. If he had said so I should have contradicted him. I have not the slightest objection to Roman Catholics being on the committee. I think it might be a courteous thing to invite persons of all denominations. My objection is to their being on the committee in the capacity of Roman Catholics.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood that his right hon. friend objected to a Roman Catholic or anyone else being forced on a body of that character merely because of his faith.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: To represent the schools.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But after all it was a theological test, and no such test should either qualify or disqualify for membership of the committee. Let no man sit in this governing body with regard to his religious faith or sect. If the Government were anxious that Roman Catholics should have a voice in the management, not merely of their own schools, but of the educational system of the country, why did they abolish the School Board? There were districts in which Roman Catholics were in a small minority, but one belonging to their religion got on to the School Board. Was not that a better system than the system now proposed? It was idle for the Prime Minister to curry favour with Catholics by proposing to allow them to become members of the committee. By the system which the opponents of this Bill wished to retain, Roman Catholics were allowed to represent their educational interests on almost every School Board throughout the country. It was assumed, because a body was more or less in the hands of Nonconformists, that therefore Anglicans and Roman Catholics were necessarily excluded from a voice in its affairs. That was perfectly absurd. The governing bodies in Wales did not exclude Roman Catholics. If a Catholic was willing to work for the general interest of the community they selected him without regard to his creed. In the county of Merioneth, which was as Nonconformist as any in Wales, they a short time ago selected a Roman Catholic for a teachership because he was a better man than the Nonconformist candidates. It was idle to talk as if there was a dead set against Roman Catholics because of their faith.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said that in his county there never had been any religious difficulty at all, and that was not because the members of the governing body did not hold strong opinions one way or another, but simply because they were willing to work in the general interest of education. Of course they were aided by the fact that under the Welsh Act there was complete exclusion of sectarian influences. The non-sectarian character of the bodies contributed to their harmonious working, and he sincerely trusted that nothing would be done by future legislation which would infringe that principle.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said it seemed to him that the real difficulty about the Clause, as it stood, was that it would be possible for sectarian bodies to nominate persons to the Education Committee who would be firebrands, and who might do a great deal of mischief. He noticed that the Prime Minister was making more and more use of the Roman Catholic case. It was a separate case, but he fully admitted, with the Prime Minister, that it could not be treated separately. He only wished that it could be treated separately. But that case should not prejudice the wider case. If these denominational representatives were put on the Education Committee, what became of the complete control of secular education by the local authority. The parents of the children attending the elementary schools elected the local Councils. While the question of religious instruction was excluded from the purview of the Education Committee, was it necessary to have these elementary schools specially represented on the Education Committee? He fully agreed with his hon. friend who moved the Amendment that the bodies he named were those most suitable to nominate their own representatives. He did not himself see that it was necessary to have special representatives of the elementary schools, although he admitted that in many cases it would be very wise if men of that kind were on the committee. But surely they were covered by the words "persons of experience in education." On the other hand, they did want experts such as would be appointed by the bodies named by the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that he thought the Clause should be modified in some direction. He had no objection at all to the County Councils voluntarily giving the right of nomination to other bodies which were interested in education, but that was a different matter from allowing a Government Department to force on the County Council the right of nomination in favour of another body against the will of the local authority. It seemed to him that the words of the Clause put it in the power of the Board of Education to force on the County Council the acceptance of a scheme which would give the right of nomination to a body to which the County Council distinctly objected. He viewed with great apprehension the friction and opposition which was sure to arise between the Education Department which had decided views and a County Council which entertained equally decided views in an opposite direction. He thought it would be most unfortunate if there was a struggle between them, and that controversies on such delicate questions should arise. The position of the County Councils would be very uncomfortable, and even intolerable; and for these reasons he should like to see some modification introduced, if not now, at a future stage—some such limiting words as "where it appears desirable," so as to give the County Council the option to say whether these other bodies should have the right of nomination or not.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he had an Amendment lower down on the Paper which substantially raised the same points involved in the discussion of the Amendment of his hon. friend, and he asked the permission of the Committee to make a few general observations on the subject. They had heard a great deal from the Prime Minister and the Attorney General the previous day and that morning, about the wishes and the position of the local authorities, the County Councils in particular. It occurred to him that it was a curious thing that the natural course had not been adopted by the Government of trying to find out from the municipalities, and the County Councils themselves what they wanted, for surely they were the best judges in this matter. The representative Municipal Associations, and the Association of County Councils had given no approval whatever to bringing in representatives of bodies unless these were educational bodies. The words of the Clause were carefully considered by both these Associations when the Bill was first printed, and when there was a desire to place the most favourable construction upon the words, some of which seemed to be rather vague, and they drew up a resolution in regard to the matter. The deputation which waited on the Duke of Devonshire was specifically of opinion that a majority of the Education Committee should be appointed from their own number. He was sure that if these mysterious words in the Clause had been explained in the manner given by the Attorney General, it would have brought down the condemnation of these important bodies. However Conservative a body the County Councils Association might be, there was a division of opinion amongst the members that did not correspond with party. It was a division between the lay and the clerical mind which was far more serious than party distinction. He believed that the County Councils Association and the Municipal Association would resent having forced on them gentlemen, however eminent, respectable, and personally popular, who were sent to "roll the log" of some particular religious denomination. The Prime Minister had used an argument with the spirit of which he entirely sympathised, but he could not agree with the conclusion which the right hon. Gentleman drew from it. He said how hard it would be if a Roman Catholic or Church of England teacher were dismissed by the interference of the managers, or the County Council itself, and there was nobody to speak for the teacher, or as it were to hold a brief on the Committee to defend the cause of the denomination. Now, he contended that cases of that kind ought to be judged impartially, and the incriminated party ought himself to be heard. He could hardly imagine anything more objectionable than that when a case of a Roman Catholic, or Church of England, or Wesleyan school came up, there should be some gentleman at the table whose bounden duty would be to get up on the Committee and argue in behalf of his particular client. That was his answer to the Prime Minister. He regretted that the hon. Member for North West Ham was not now in his place, because he had told the Committee the previous day that what he desired was a system of representation which he found last year on a visit to Zurich in Switzerland. The hon. Member for North West Ham had told the Committee that his ideal was that the nominations should come from great educational bodies, as was the case in Zurich. That was what was proposed in the Amendment, which might be called the Zurich Amendment. Let it not be said again that the Opposition were opposed to co-optation. What they were opposed to was nomination by sectarian and denominational bodies. They knew the machinery of co-optation and were strong partisans of it. He knew gentlemen who had been originally opposed to co-optation, but who had been converted to it by the admirable manner in which men, chosen by co-optation, did their work. He wanted to ask the Prime Minister whether the meaning of these two sub-Sections, taken together, was that the committees should consist entirely of representatives of the County Council, and those persons nominated by the representative bodies, or whether the scheme also provided for co-option. Suppose the committee consisted of twenty members, and that the County Council only appointed one, were the remaining nineteen to be all of the class described in sub-Section (*b*); or was it to be in the power of the County Councils to appoint four or five representatives from public bodies, and the others by co-optation?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The second alternative is the right one.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said that that should be made clear in the Clause, because it was not clear now. He hoped that before the Report stage of the Bill was reached, the Government would carefully consider the views of the great municipal bodies and County Councils who, he was sure, did not wish sectarian and denominational interests thrust into their midst. They ought to be free from the unfortunate animosity that had done so much to injure the cause of education in the past.

*(1.30.) MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) said he quite agreed that the kind of bodies the hon. Member indicated in his Amendment were bodies which might naturally have the power under the scheme of appointing members of the Education Committee, but these were not all the bodies which ought to have a right to that privilege. As an hon. Member who had had practical experience upon this point, he should like to state what took place in regard to the London County Council and its Education Committee. The London County Council was not obliged to admit anybody but members of its own body, but they adopted a very much wiser course, and while maintaining that a majority of the committee should be members of the Council they admitted an almost equal number of other people. Amongst the bodies represented on the London County Council Education Committee were the London Trades Council, the London School Board, the Association of Head-masters, the National Union of Teachers, the City of London Guilds Institute, and the City Parochial Trustees who were concerned with the London Polytechnics. In addition to these there were two or three members appointed by co-optation. University College and King's College were also represented. The circumstances of different districts differed enormously, and it was useless to prescribe that what was suitable for London would be suitable for a remote district of Devonshire, and some latitude must be given to the local authority and the Board of Education as to what sort of people should be co-opted. The more freedom of choice they gave the better, because different circumstances required different treatment, and in this way they were more likely to get suitable people. With regard to this sectarian question he did not know that it should have been raised at all. There might be districts in which the diocesan associations should have a nomination, but there were districts where this would not be advisable. He did not recognise that any particular denomination or association had any claim, except under very special circumstances, to nominate a member of the Education Committee. They ought to trust their officials to behave like reasonable and sensible people, and to do their best to find in each particular district the representatives who would be of the greatest service.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said they had not all got the same child-like faith as to the manner in which this Act would be administered as the hon. Member. Religious difficulties had caused much sectarian strife in the past. This Clause appeared to him at the outset a very curious Clause to construe, and still more difficult to enforce. He understood it could be enforced by *mandamus*. The new construction put upon the Clause by the explanations of the Prime Minister had produced a very dark outlook. Take the county of Lincoln. The Prime Minister said it would not be merely permissive but obligatory on the County Councils to appoint even a representative of the

Roman Catholic Voluntary Association in the county of Lincoln. If that were correct, it was a very unjust condition.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: But it does not do that.

MR. PERKS said he understood now that there was no obligation of this kind on the County Councils to appoint representatives of voluntary associations, and it was permissive.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: That is so.

MR. PERKS said there were in the county of Lincoln not more than twenty Roman Catholic schools in the villages, and not more than forty or fifty Wesleyan schools, while there were 350 Anglican schools. Surely the Anglican and the Wesleyan schools would not wish to have representation except through the favour of the elected representatives. Surely the Anglican schools had sufficient protection by the preponderance of the representation on the managers board and the influence they exercised over the County Council. Why should they recognise the voluntary associates and diocesan conferences which in his county were remarkable only for the line of cleavage between the views of the laymen and the clergy, especially on educational questions. It was impossible to take up any report of a diocesan conference or congress in his county without seeing that they were constantly at loggerheads, particularly in regard to the administration of the Elementary Education Act. This exception was not wanted by the great Nonconformist Church of this country, who did not ask for it, and though there might have been some compact made between the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church to secure this exception, he ventured to say that this was a phase of the question which had not been disclosed to Parliament, and it had not dawned upon the electors of the country, and certainly not upon the educationists in the rural districts, to whom this Clause would prove to be a very objectionable one.

*MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) in a maiden speech, said he wished to touch upon one or two points in the Amendment. He thought there were other bodies who ought to assist in the work of the committee. If Government would allow the present conditions to remain unaltered, and gave the County Council the entire right to call in whom they liked, he would favour allowing the Clause to stand as at present. It was because the Government refused to allow the present municipalities and County Councils to have the powers they now possessed that he rose to object to the position they took up. If it was desired to include the special bodies mentioned in the Amendment, he would move a further Amendment that trades unions, and co-operative associations should also be included. He desired to give one or two reasons for holding that those two organisations should be so included. Take the case of trades unions. He was connected with one that gave ten free scholarships for certain branches of technical instruction, and was closely connected with another that gave every year thirty free scholarships, and a prize of 5s. to everyone that passed certain examinations. He was also connected with a co-operative society which gave a free scholarship to the children of its members who took advantage of the opportunities offered by the Technical Instruction Committee. He contended that those bodies had certain claims, but he did not trust the Government with respect to them. The reason was because he had in his hand a few words which were used by an official of the Government who had charge over a certain Department. That official said: "I must decline to recognise the union as intermediary or to receive a deputation which may purport to convey the views of its members." When a Government permitted any official to use words like that in connection with their trades union he was not prepared to trust them in that matter. He asked that the Government would permit the powers referred to to be given to the local authorities as at present, and said then he would support any resolution which distinctly stated what societies were to be brought into that Clause.

*MR. JAMES HOPE said he did not believe that in one case out of ten would any serious difference arise between the County Council and the Education Department upon the point suggested by the hon. Member for East Somerset. With regard to what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman who last spoke, he thought there were cases where the trades councils ought to be represented on the educational body. In his own constituency he thought it would be right that there should be some trade union representation. All he said was that the demand for representation by all these bodies on the Educational Committees could only be justified on grounds of educational interest. He utterly denied that because a body is denominational it might not also be educational. The denominational associations were working, and did their part, and took their place in the great work of national education. He supported the proposal on the converse ground that if they did not give this representation they would exclude the energy and zeal of large bodies of men, and estrange them from this great work. The School Board had, as a fact, through the cumulative vote, brought to education the sympathies of large bodies of men who worked harmoniously together, and if in the future the right of minorities to take their part in the system of the education of this country, which they had in the past, was denied, it would estrange some very valuable elements which our national system could ill afford to part with.

MR SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said he thought the sound thing to do in this case was to allow the County Councils themselves, as part of their duty, to consider the claims of everybody, upon purely educational grounds, and in that way make provision for the representation of all persons interested in education. The objection to the proposal of the Government was that they were giving to the denominational bodies a status which they never had before: they would give them a power of nomination, which would never be taken away, and thereby give them a status, not as an educational but as a denominational body. The really sensible thing to do was to leave it to the educational body to exercise their judgment and bring in those they thought were best. It must be remembered that these committees would deal with secondary as well as elementary education. Up to now, they had been successful in excluding this denominational strife, of which they were all sick and tired, from questions relating to secondary education, but now, if these bodies were given the power to nominate persons to serve on these committees, they would introduce all this old strife into not only elementary education, but, for the first time, into the secondary system as well.

(1.53.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 158; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 486.)

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Artnur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside

Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore John Throgmorton
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Wm. M'Arthur.

(2.3.) Question put accordingly, "That the word 'other' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 487.) (2.15).

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Williams Rt Hn J. Powell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Kenna, Reginald

Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
MiddlemoreJohnThrogmorton
Morgan, J. Loyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Channing and Mr. Henry J. Wilson.

(2.43.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "acts," inclusive, in page 4, line 39, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "acts," inclusive, in page 4, line 39, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 157; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 488).

Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot,Capt.Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ(Manc'r.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary(St.Albans)
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Hain, Edward
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.).
Jessel,CaptainHerbertMerton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W.(Salop
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.HnWalter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Maxwell,WJH(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.AGraham(Bute
Murray,Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hon.M.W(Stalybridge
Ritchie,RtHon.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert)Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.

Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.

(2.53.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 169; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 489.)

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Hain, Edward
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somesset, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood

Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thomson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalyb'dge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke. Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.

(3.8.) MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District), in moving the next Amendment, said that, as he understood the Clause as now construed by the Attorney General, it was quite possible that not a single Member of the County Council might be on the Education Committee, although the right hon. and learned Gentleman said that it could hardly be conceived that any County Council would adopt that extreme course. However even if the County Council did not adopt such an extreme course as that, it might appoint only a certain number of its own members, and ten or twelve from the outside. It seemed to him, in regard to the nominees of the County Council, that it was highly important that they should be substantial persons, acquainted with the interests of the locality in which they were to act, and not merely educational experts. Unless a qualification of the kind he proposed were introduced, the object they had in view would not be obtained.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, after the word 'acts' to insert the words 'provided that two-thirds of the persons appointed by the Council shall be resident ratepayers in such area.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that the Amendment followed the analogy of the practice of the Local Government Board. Where the Local Government Board had the power of adding persons to local bodies, such as Boards of Guardians, there was invariably the qualification that all of them should be ratepayers in the locality. The reason for that was obvious. It was that they should be persons interested in economy. Though the analogy was complete, he thought his hon. friend was right in putting in two-thirds, because the effect of a complete restriction would be to prevent the appointment of married women.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said that there was a substantial difference between the bodies mentioned by the right hon. Baronet and that which was now under consideration. The committee now proposed to be set up by the Bill was an advisory committee, the rating powers and the power of spending money being expressly reserved to the Council. If the committee had had the power of expending the rates, then the argument of the right hon. Baronet would have been a strong one, but in this case the committee was only to advise as to what was necessary in the interests of education, and in that case it did not seem desirable to limit the local authority, in the selection of gentlemen to act on the committee, to those who were resident ratepayers in the area. He maintained that the argument of the Attorney General was sound; it was ridiculous to suppose that any County Council, being given full powers to select an advisory committee as they liked, should only choose outsiders. Such a case had never existed, and he did not believe that it could exist. Why should Parliament make it impossible for the Councils to select somebody in their neighbourhood who, although they were not ratepayers, might be well worthy to be on the committee? He himself felt strongly that the County Councils and the great Borough Councils had shown themselves deserving of having complete confidence being placed in them. If the County Councils and great Borough Councils could not be trusted to select proper persons, whether ratepayers or not, to serve on the committee, they were not fit to be trusted with any of the duties to be imposed upon them under this Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the President of the Local Government Board had now discovered, after sub-Section (*b*) was passed, that the County Councils of the country were worthy of the most complete confidence. If so, why not trust them altogether? The Government, however, declined to do so, and forced upon them the nominees of other bodies which they did not want. The President of the Local Government Board had forgotten that it was not the County Councils which the Opposition were afraid of, but the foreign elements which were being introduced into the Committee. Under the Clause there might be placed on the committee bishops, prebendaries, and other people who had no interest, and were not resident in the district. What an extraordinary position for the Government to take! They said they trusted the County Councils, and yet imposed all sorts of limitations upon them. The only complete and absolute trust they had was in the sectarian managers.

MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton) said he objected to the Amendment of his hon. friend, and for this reason. In the county of Chester they had not a very large number of bodies to which the County Council would like to apply to choose outside representatives; but just over the border, in Lancashire, there were many institutions such as Owens College, Manchester, or University College, Liverpool, which they might like to ask to nominate representatives. There were also great technical schools in the county of Lancashire, and in the county boroughs, which might well be asked to nominate representatives. The Amendment would prevent the Cheshire County Council from doing that. So it was also in the case of Birmingham. He thought it would be a great pity to limit the number of representatives from outside authorities to one-third.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said they were under a difficulty in discussing Amendments of this description, because they did not yet know what was to be the size of the Education Committee. A phrase had been used by the Prime Minister in the course of the morning in which, while deprecating the objections of the Opposition to representatives of outside bodies, he said that there might be only two or three out of forty-five or fifty. That was the only indication which they had had as to the size of the committee. He assumed that in many cases it would be larger, and in other cases smaller. He regarded the Amendment of his hon. friend as sound, and he was rather astonished to hear from his hon. friend the Member for Luton, that in the county of Chester they could not find enough ratepayers fitted to form at all events two-thirds of the Education Committee, and that they must go to Liverpool and Manchester, or even to Birmingham for them. In regard to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, the President of the Local Government Board, whose intervention in the debate he welcomed most heartily, that the Opposition did not trust the County Councils. Now, what they had said all along was that the County Councils ought to be trusted so fully that the educational work ought to be done by the members of the Councils themselves; at anyrate, that they ought not to go out of the jurisdiction of the County Councils for members of the Education Committee. Now, it was said that they did not trust the County Councils because they would not allow them a discretion! The right hon. Gentleman had argued that resident ratepayers were not necessary, as the committee was merely an advisory body, a chameleon body. It was quite true that it was an advisory body, and that it did not actually spend the money any more than it raised the rates. But it was the body that advised the spending of the money, and unless its advice was thrown overboard, which would be the exception, it was tantamount to being the body that spent the money.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he would point out what had been forgotten by the President of the Local Government Board, that the Education Committee was a great deal more than an advisory body. It might be an executive body, because by the Bill as it stood the Council might delegate the power of so acting that the raising of a rate to carry out the inevitable consequence of its action must be unavoidable. He thought it was quite unfair, therefore, to say that the Education Committee was only an advisory body.

(3.23.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 92; Noes, 170. (Division List No. 490.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone

Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthan
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, W. R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Brynmor Jones and Mr. Samuel Evans.

NOES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Maxwell, W J H. (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hon. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(3.35.) MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he wished to move to insert "(*c*) For the inclusion of women as well as men among the members of the committee." He should have thought the committee would be agreed that the work of women on educational bodies was of great value, and that their presence on them was desirable from all points of view, but for some remarks of the hon. Member for Glamorgan yesterday. He wished to remind the Committee of the invariable good work that women had rendered on School Boards in the past; and considering that the Bill abolished School Boards, they ought to see, in doing that, that the opportunities of women for taking part in educational work were not diminished. Personally, he had had experience of the valuable work of women in educational matters, and he wished to vouch for the great assistance they had been. If it were necessary to add anything on the subject, he would quote the words of the Lord President of the Council in the House of Lords a few years ago, in which the noble Lord bore testimony in the most sympathetic language to the admirable way in which women discharged educational duties. When it was considered that half of the young people in the schools were of the female sex, and no less than two-thirds of the teachers in the elementary schools were of that sex also, would any one deny the claims of women to be duly represented on the bodies which guided and presided over education? Some hon. Members might be inclined to say, "That is all very well, but the Bill proposes to put them on equal terms with men in this respect." It was true that the Bill proposed to make them eligible; but did it propose to put them on equal terms with men? Would they have the same opportunities, and would they have the same likelihood of getting on Education Committees as men? He thought not, considering that the Education Committees would be appointed by bodies from which women were at present excluded. Women were, rightly or wrongly he would not now argue, excluded by law from County Councils and Borough Councils; and that made it very unlikely that they would have the same opportunity of getting on Education Committees that men would possess. They had had recent and extensive experience of the matter. On Technical Instruction Committees women were equally eligible to serve with men; but what was the fact? Out of 115 bodies that appointed Technical Instruction Committees only 20 had appointed women on them. That was the experience of the last ten years on the subject most analogous to that before the Committee. The Royal Commission on Secondary Education pointed out some years ago that there was a risk that women would not be chosen on a body like that proposed unless some special provision were made to include them; and he ventured to think that the experience of the past few years had gone far to emphasise their words. Indeed, most of those who had considered the subject agreed that there was serious risk that women would not be appointed on many of these bodies, unless some provision were inserted to ensure their presence in due numbers. There would be no difficulty in doing that. It could be done in the scheme, as was constantly done in schemes drawn up by the Charity Commissioners, and in various other ways. He wished to say a word to the rather timid members of the Committee who appeared to fall into a state of exaggerated alarm whenever the word woman was mentioned. He wished to assure them that there was no covert purpose in his proposal, and no suggestion that municipal bodies should admit women. He had hitherto been personally opposed to the political claims of women, but for that very reason it was more incumbent on him than on other hon. Members to declare his view that in a matter such as that before the Committee women should not suffer any injustice. There were several Amendments to his proposal. He would welcome the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet opposite, but in reference to other Amendments he wished to assure the Government that if they would only sympathise with his proposal, the express form of the words mattered little to him, as long as they secured a due proportion of women on the committees, and not only made women eligible, but gave some security for their presence on these bodies.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, at end to insert, '(*c*) For the inclusion of women as well as men among the members of the committee.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BRYCE said he was glad the Amendment came from the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset, because that showed that the question was not one which in any sense divided the Committee on Party lines. He assured the Government that many Members had been recipients of communications which had convinced them of the width, depth, and strength of the feeling that existed, not only among women, but among men, in favour of some compulsory provision for the inclusion of women. It was not necessary that he should add anything to what had been said as to the value of the work which had been done by women. As the hon. Gentleman said, with great truth, now that School Boards, on which women had done such excellent work, were to be abolished, and as they could not by law sit on County Councils, it was all the more necessary to make a very clear and emphatic provision for their presence on the Education Committees. Like the hon. Gentleman, he himself had never been able to vote for giving the Parliamentary franchise to women, but that was all the more reason why those of them who had always said that women could safely trust to the goodwill and fairness of this House to make provision for giving them their due share in the public life of the country should endeavour to secure it for them in this matter. If women were asked to be content with the goodwill and care of Parliament, surely this was a case in which that goodwill and care should be shown. It had been his privilege, along with the hon. Member for East Somerset and the hon. Member for Cambridge University opposite, and with the hon. Member for West Nottingham, on his own side of the House, to sit on a Royal Commission on Education on which there were three ladies. They were not only among the most valuable members of the Commision, but their knowledge, their experience, and their practical suggestions bearing on education questions were invaluable, and the Commission separated with the feeling that they could not possibly have dealt with the questions submitted to them in what they hoped and believed was a fairly exhaustive fashion if it had not been for the help these ladies afforded. The remarkable change in the position of women in the last thirty years and the part they now took in many occupations and professions for which special instruction was necessary, from which they were formerly debarred, partly through want of knowledge and special training, and partly through old-fashioned prejudice, suggested an additional reason for supporting this Amendment. One of the most important parts of the work of these committees would be that which concerned technical instruction, and he thought women would be of the utmost possible value on the committees when questions concerning the employment of women and the fitting of women for professions were considered, and that any committee would be lame and imperfect in the discharge of its duties concerning technical instruction, without their presence. For these reasons he appealed to the Committee to secure that women should be placed on these committees. It would, unfortunately, not be in order to secure under this Bill that they should sit on the Council as elective members. What was left to the Committee to do was to secure that they should be members of the committees. As evidence that it was necessary to make an absolute provision he would point to the Act of 1869, which extended to women the benefits of educational endowments. That had been carried out to a very limited extent; and every educational authority would agree that much more might have been done by the Charity Commissioners in order to make educational endowments available to women. With regard to the proposal on the Paper defining women as "married or single," he suggested that the Attorney General should give an opinion as to the necessity for this Amendment, on which he looked with a little uneasiness. Hitherto women had been allowed to serve on School Boards and other bodies without any question as to whether they were married or single, and it occurred to him that there might be a risk in introducing the Amendment, as it might by implication be held to raise a doubt as to the status of women who on other bodies served without question of disqualification by marriage. The Committee should not be content with any Amendment that merely expressed an opinion favourable to the appointment of women on these committees. They could not leave the claims of women in this matter to the casual benevolence of any County or Borough Council, but should secure their presence on the committees by making it a matter of law.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said with regard to the question put to his hon. and learned friend, he understood that the Attorney General was inclined to think that some method of dealing with the legal difficulty the right hon. Gentleman had suggested ought to be found, but this was clearly not the place to insert what would be more suited to a definition Clause. On the merits of the question he thought they were all of one mind—that women ought to serve upon these committees. He did not think anybody doubted that women had now an enormous share in the education of the country; and having that enormous share they ought to have some share in the counsels by which the educational policy of the country was to be directed. There was probably no district of the country where there were not either educational establishments specifically devoted to the education of girls and women, or where, if there was none, the question of the special needs of women and girls would not come within the purview of the new education authority. The only doubt, therefore, was whether this should be made mandatory. He observed a somewhat remarkable change of front on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the mode in which County Councils should be treated as to the co-optation of members under this Clause. In the early part of the discussion, not to trust the County Councils to select what bodies they should have represented on the committees was regarded as perfectly monstrous, and an insult to, and a degradation of, those education authorities; now it was said they must not trust to what the right hon. Gentleman termed the casual benevolence of County and Borough Councils. Why they might be absolutely trusted when dealing with other interests, but might not be trusted when dealing with the interests of more than half the community, he could not imagine. If it were worth while to challenge hon. Members opposite on the logical consistency of their scheme of argument, it would be interesting to know how this could be explained. Speaking for himself, he would support his hon. friend, the only possible question, he thought, being whether the proposal should be in a mandatory form, or in the milder nature of a recommendation. He, at all events, could say that, as regarded any charge of inconsistency in this matter, his withers were unwrung.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the answer to the right hon. Gentleman's charge of inconsistency in this matter was that women had now an assured and honourable position in connection with education by their position as elective members of the School Board, and they were being deprived of that position by the destruction of the School Boards. The proper remedy would be to make them eligible to the Councils. Thirty years ago, or even twenty years ago, that could have been done under the Bill by means of an Instruction on going into Committee; and he believed the majority of the Committee would have been favourable to it were it now possible. But it was not possible; and that was why they were driven to this unsatisfactory way of dealing with the question. Therefore, they were unharmed by the charge of inconsistency made by the right hon. Gentleman. With reference to his Amendment, he would not deal with it at length, as its principle had been accepted by the hon. Gentleman opposite. It was, however, quite true, as his right hon. friend had said, that the words he proposed would, to some extent, weaken the position of women on School Boards if they continued to exist; but they were to be abolished. Further, legal opinion was that the position of married women was more than doubtful. He therefore joined in the request of his right hon. friend to the Attorney General for his opinion on the question. His own view was that it was most dangerous to leave the question to the courts of law, remembering what the courts had already done in passing over the plain intentions of the Legislature as to peaceful picketting the Truck Law, and also in these questions relating to women. It was essential that what they meant should be made clear in the Bill. There was the famous case decided in 1872 as to the meaning of the Act of 1869, of which he was one of the promoters, giving the municipal franchise to women. In that case it was held that a woman who was rightly on the register could not vote, because she had married before the election; and in face of the arguments by which that view was unanimously maintained by a very strong court, it was obviously most dangerous to leave the question vague. In the decision to which he had referred, the Lord Chief Justice said that it was quite certain, by common law, that a married woman's status was so merged in that of her husband, that she was incapable of exercising almost all public functions. The Committee would observe that the word "almost" disappeared from the decision of Lord Esher in the Sandhurst case, and having regard to the language used by Lord Esher in that decision with regard to the disability of women to exercise any public function, it would be most extraordinary if the Government did not agree to the Amendment.

(4.0.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said the right hon. Baronet had dealt with the manner in which the Courts had ignored the "plain intentions" of the Legislature. All the Courts had to do was to interpret the Acts passed by the Legislature, and any complaint that they declined to go outside the four corners of the Act was neither relevant nor called for. There was enough doubt about this matter to make it proper that in the definition Clause they should say that marriage should not be a disqualification in the case of women or of men. It could be put in here, but as it was desirable that it should also apply to the managers of schools, he would embody the words in the definition Clause.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he regarded the question of what rights women should have in matters pertaining to the State as an exceedingly grave and serious matter, and a great constitutional question. This was a matter which ought not to be dealt with piecemeal. They had the opinion of the right hon. Baronet that women should occupy the same status as men, even up to the right of sitting in this House. If that was the general opinion, the matter should be dealt with constitutionally once and for all. In his view, however, in all matters of administration and government, men could do all that was required without the assistance of women at all, and in ninety-nine cases out of 100 could do it better. He did not say that women had not been useful members of School Boards and Local Government Boards, but those women still remained exceptions to women as a rule. Men had dealt with education for years, and women previously had taken no part in it. It was now suggested by the hon. Member for East Somerset that it had not been dealt with properly because they had not employed women. The position was this that women where they were eligible by Act of Parliament had not taken any active part in educational matters.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: That was not the fault of the women, but of the men who were put on the appointing bodies.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS thought the hon. Member would not say that the Technical Instruction Committees had not done their work properly without the assistance of women. What it was now sought to do was to make it compulsory to elect women on these educational bodies. He understood this was to be an open question. He had a strong opinion that they ought not to compel the local education authorities to appoint women to these committees, whether they could find suitable women or not. Women in general had no desire to enter into public life at all. There was a great deal about public life, and even about elections, that it was desirable that women should not come into, and to say in this Bill that they must be elected was taking a very rapid step in advance. He recommended the Committee very strongly not to make it compulsory.

MR. BARTLEY said he should really like to know what the issue was. He agreed with the hon. Member opposite. He agreed that women should be eligible, but if the Amendment meant that it should be compulsory that a certain number of women should be placed on these committees, he should vote against it. They ought to know what the Government intended.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said, as he understood it, women were by law eligible for these committees. The question at issue was whether the local authority should have regard to the representation of women on the Committee, or whether the scheme should provide compulsorily for the inclusion of at least one woman.

MR ERNEST GRAY said that, when this subject was referred to at an earlier stage of the Bill, he had expressed a hope that it would be finally settled that on every one of these committees a certain number of women should be included. It was absolutely essential that women should come into close connection with the working of the schools. There were many thousands of children under seven; many thousands in girls' schools, and many more in what were known as the mixed schools. How were they to get satisfaction unless the teachers could turn to some woman on the Board? On the grounds of health, and comfort, and sanitation in the schools, it was absolutely necessary that the teachers should be able to approach a woman and tell her the position. These matters could not be left to chance. He entirely agreed that, so long as the appointing body was composed of men, there was a danger that the claims of women would be overlooked. He did not approach this question with any view to giving women more power, but entirely from the standpoint of the children instructed in the schools, and they had unanswerable arguments which, viewed from the children's point of view, showed that further needs would arise in future. He might mention the excellent work done by women in some parts of the country in that type of school in which women were trained, a type of which they knew far too little. The desire was evidently to make women more decorative than useful, but when women were brought into close connection with this work, there was a strong desire to make them useful as well as decorative. He should go into the Lobby in support of this Amendment without hesitation, and he trusted all his friends on that side of the House would support him. Some of the best friends children ever had were women, married as well as single.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that the debates of the House had been conducted on the supposition that the new local authority would have the charge and care of schools only. As a matter of fact, it would also have charge of a large number of nurseries where very young children—far too young to instruct, and who ought not to be instructed at all in the ordinary sense of being instructed—were kept in order that their parents might go to work. He had as profound a faith in the capability of men for managing schools as the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan, but none in their capability for managing nurseries. There it was absolutely necessary to have the advice of women, and a great number of matters connected with the health of the very young children in our schools urgently demanded more of the attention of women than they now received. Though reluctant to interfere with the discretion of the new local authorities, he could not object to this direction being given to them.

Question put and agreed to.

*MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) said that in the absence and at the request of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tewkesbury, he had consented to move the Amendment standing in his right hon. friend's name. The Amendment proposed to extend to the nominated and co-opted members of the Education Committee the disqualification which already attached to members of the County Council. It followed the language of Section 12 of the Municipal Corporation Act of 1882 which, by the Act of 1888, was applied to County Councils. He understood from his right hon. friend that the Government, at first disposed to accept the Amendment, were subsequently inclined to think that eminent educationists, such as the Principal of Owens College, would be disqualified merely because the institutions to which they belonged were subsidised by the local education authority. The last sentence had been added to the Amendment to provide against that possibility. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, at the end, to insert the following words: 'Provided that a person shall be disqualified for being a member of an Education Committee, who, by reason of holding an office or place of profit, or having any share or interest in a contract, or employment, is disqualified for being a member of the council appointing the Education Committee. But no such disqualification shall apply to a person by reason only of his holding office in a school or college aided, but not provided or maintained, by the Council.'"—(*Mr. A. K. Loyd.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that he was doubtful as to the proper line for the Committee to take on this Amendment. His first instincts had been entirely in favour of the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The first part.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Exactly, but without the rider which had been added to it many persons who ought to be included would be excluded; and with the rider, a very invidious distinction was drawn between institutions which were aided and those which were provided by the public authority. Therefore his whole feeling had undergone a change with regard to it. He was now inclined to think it would be better to rely on the fact that the Education Committee was a purely advisory body, the mere creature of the County Council, and that there was no popular election to it or the possibility of such canvassing by interested persons as had done harm in some cases. On the whole, the disadvantages associated with the Amendment outweighed the advantages, and he should recommend his hon. friend not to press the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE thought that there was great force in what the right hon. Gentleman had said. There was one aspect of the subject, however, which should be considered. The Council might delegate large spending powers to a committee which might be entrusted with a considerable control of accounts.

4.30. MR. LLOYD-GEORGE agreed there ought to be a provision inserted in the Clause which should prevent a contractor from being on a committee controlling expenditure. But he did not think there was so much difficulty with regard to the second part as the Prime Minister seemed to apprehend. His own objection to the Amendment was that it excluded the possibility of a teacher of a primary school being on the committee, and in that way it limited unfairly the discretion of the Council. The only teacher who could be put on would be a teacher of a secondary school, whereas it was much more important that a teacher in a primary school should be on, because most of the expenditure would be in connection with primary education.

*MR. A. K. LOYD said he felt sure that no such result was intended by the right hon. Baronet, who had drafted his proviso to meet the doubt suggested by the Government as to the exclusion of teachers from aided institutions like Owens College. This effect of the limited terms used to carry out that purpose was wide altogether of the evil aimed at, and if the case of admitting the elementary teachers had not been already provided, for the proper words should be used to include them as eligible for these committees.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that in regard to the county governing bodies in

Wales, it had been made an absolute condition that a teacher should be appointed, and the teachers amongst themselves elected the most efficient representative. He moved to omit the words "but not" so as to make the closing portion of the Amendment read, "But no such disqualification shall apply to a person by reason only of his holding office in a school or college aided, provided, or maintained by the Council." The Council ought to be perfectly free to put a teacher on the committee if they chose, no matter what school he was in, but at the same time it was very undesirable that contractors should be on a committee practically dealing with their own work.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 6, to omit 'but not.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'but not' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) thought that just as it might be advantageous to have a teacher on the committee, so sometimes it might also be advantageous to have a clerk or some other official receiving a salary from the local authority. The real question to consider was the exclusion of jobbery, leaving an option to the authority to put a teacher or a clerk on the subordinate bodies, and he ventured to suggest that some form of words should be devised by which that would be possible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was informed by the Attorney General that while the word "contract" was perfectly clear in the connection in which it occurred in this Amendment, it would not be so clear if they cut out the words "office or place of profit" or "employment." He thought, however, that the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs would meet the case.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said it was the invariable rule of large municipalities not to have on their committees persons in any way engaged in contracts or work connected with the Council, or anyone in its employ. The first part of the Amendment would deal with that matter, while if the Amendment of his hon. friend were accepted it would be possible to secure the services of persons specially acquainted with the work of primary education to the great advantage of the general administration of primary education. They ought, however, absolutely to exclude from the committee all persons directly employed by the Council or interested in any contract or work undertaken by the Council in connection with the administration of the Act.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL was afraid that the Committee by drawing the line too tight in imposing disqualifications would exclude the valuable services of many competent persons. He cited a case where the chairman of a large technical school had devoted a great deal of time to developing and executing a plan, in addition to giving a large amount of money. He discovered accidentally that one of his subordinates had made, without his knowledge, a very small contract with one of the authorities. The result was that the chairman withdrew, and the town lost the benefit of his services. It would be lamentable if through the operation of such a provision as that proposed the Councils were deprived of the advantage of such valuable services.

MR. EMMOTT hoped that the Committee would accept the Amendment as amended by the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs. Such a case as that mentioned by the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan would open wide the door to any kind of jobbery. Hard cases might arise, but the Committee could not allow for them in a matter of this sort.

MR. ERNEST GRAY endorsed the view just expressed, and hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs. According to a return he had read, there were 600 teachers engaged in primary and secondary schools who had already been invited by the Borough Councils to share in the work of technical education. It would be a gross misfortune if the committees of the future were to lose the services of these people which had been so gladly given in the past, and the

Amendment of the hon. Member would provide against any such loss. The country having spent large sums of money in training teachers had a right to say that the experience and acquired knowledge of those teachers should be at the service of the State when required. There was also the case of the inspectors. It was the almost universal rule on the Continent for the inspectors to be on committees of this description. But they, being persons in receipt of salaries from that authority, would not be covered by the suggested Amendment, and to meet their case a further alteration would be required.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) understood that there was no general law applicable to this case. What was wanted was to provide against any member of the committee giving a vote which would in any way benefit himself. He suggested that members of the committee who were not members of the local authority should have no vote, but only power to advise, and he had placed an Amendment on the Paper to that effect.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) hoped the Amendment, so far as its first Clause was concerned, would be adhered to in the form proposed. As he understood, the hon. Member desired to apply to the constitution of the education authority the same principle of qualification as applied to the Council which created the authority. Unless such a provision were made, the mischiefs that had been guarded against in the case of members of the Council would creep into the constitution of the Education Committee. The standard proposed was one that had been construed; it was defined in the statutes, and well understood, therefore if it was applied to the new body, no confusion or difficulty would arise. If, however, the Government listened to the appeal to allow more latitude in regard to the constitution of the education authority, new words would have to be framed and another interpretation given, and there would be a class of persons who, though not eligible for the Council, were eligible for the education authority. The Council would thus be able to put on the education authority persons who, by reason of their interest, would be excluded from the membership of their own body, and an anomaly would be introduced. That difficulty would be guarded against by the words as originally proposed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR recommended the Committee to bring the discussion to a conclusion by adopting his hon. friend's Amendment, subject to the alteration proposed by the hon. Member for Carnarvon. That seemed to be the general view of the Committee, and though he was quite ready to consider the matter again before Report, he was pretty sure it was the right thing to do.

Amendment to proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

*MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne) moved the insertion of a new sub-Section—

"(*e*) For the appointment, if desired, of members of School Boards existing at the time of the passing of this Act as members of the first Committee."

He could conceive of only two objections being urged against the proposal—first, that owing to its non-compulsory character it was valueless; and, secondly, that owing to the fact that the suggested course would be almost invariably followed, it was unnecessary. He contended, however, that the provision was neither so valueless nor unnecessary as it might at first sight appear. As to its general desirability, he thought there could be no two opinions. No one could deny the desirability of the experience of the past being taken advantage of in the operations of the future. To those who viewed with no little regret the fact that the uniformity and co-ordination required by the Bill involved the extinction of the School Boards in the large cities, it would be some compensation if they could feel sure that the services of the experienced men who had been members of those Boards could be utilised by the new bodies about to be created. He trusted that the Amendment would have the effect of causing the local education authority to include in their scheme some members of the existing School Boards, and, wherever possible, lady members. It would be in the nature of a suggestion to the local authority to take that course. He believed County and Borough Councils would in many cases be anxious to avail themselves of this experience in a twofold way. In selecting members of their own body they would, wherever possible, choose those who had had experience of School Board work in the past, and, in selecting the additions to the Education Committees, they might appoint those who have the present experience. In this way the transfer would be effected with as little interruption as possible, and the new bodies would be kept in touch with the whole staff of the existing School Board. To the teachers and others there would then appear on the Education Committees, if not old friends with new faces, at anyrate old friends in new places, and the change would be made with as little friction as possible to the great advantage both of education and of the children and of all concerned. The Amendment was limited to the constitution of the Committee in the first instance, and in no way tied the hands of the local authorities in the future. Moreover, its acceptance would show that the charge sometimes levelled against hon. Members on that side, of hostility to School Boards, was not justified. He had always declared that School Boards, as a rule, had done their work well. Where they had come in conflict with public opinion was in a few cases in large towns by exceeding their duty, and in not a few cases in country districts by too often neglecting their duty. But it was one thing to affirm that they had on the whole done their work well, and another to approve the continuance of an educational system under which, financially, the schools educating more than half the children of the country had in the past been unduly handicapped. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words, '(*e*) For the appointment (if desirable) of members of School Boards existing at the time of the passing of this Act as members of the first committee.'"—(*Mr. Plummer.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the Amendment of my hon. friend would be an improvement, and we are prepared to adopt it.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) moved to leave out the words "if desirable," so as to make it mandatory on the County Councils to appoint members of the School Boards.

(5.3.) Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'if desirable.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 185; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 491.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, LordCharlesWilliam
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, RtHn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirE. W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jessel,CaptainHerbertMerton
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton,Hon.FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis, William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,WJH(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Milner,Rt.Hn.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu,Hon.J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicol Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch,Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward.
Spencer, Sir E.(W. Bromwich)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHnJ.G(Oxf'rdUniv.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.HnSirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan,SirWilliam(Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. CharlesH.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Lambert, George
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
M'Arthur, William Cornwall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid,SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,HenryJ.(York,W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Corrie Grant and Mr. John Ellis.

Words inserted.

(5.13.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the

Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "made," inclusive, in page 5, line 15, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "made," inclusive, in page 5, in line 15, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 179; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 492.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lees, Sir Elliott, (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgm'rton
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whitmore, Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm.
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles

Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hon. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(5.23.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 177; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 493.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A, (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dix'n
Doughty, George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S F. Ormsby-(Linc
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. N.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hn. William Edw. H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hon J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rae, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hon. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.

It being after half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

NOTICE TO EXPEDITE DEBATE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is irregular, but it may be convenient to the House that I should say that on Tuesday next I propose to move a Resolution (which will be placed on the Paper tonight) which will, I hope, have for its object to enable Parliament to deal with the Bill on which we are now engaged before the Christmas holidays.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): All I need say is this. The right hon. Gentleman makes his announcement in somewhat covert language. If it implies the abridgment of debate, we shall meet any such Resolution with the most determined opposition.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 10*th November*, 1902.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BROMPTON AND PICCADILLY CIRCUS RAILWAY (NEW LINES, ETC.) BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered and agreed to.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed: and referred to the Examiners. (No. 185.)

PETITIONS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.—

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).

List of exceptions to the Army regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1902. (November 4.)

TRADE REPORTS.

I. Annual Series:—

No. 2911. Russia (Riga, etc.) (November 5.)

No. 2912. China. (November 5.)

II. Miscellaneous Series:—

No. 584. United States: Agriculture of the State of Maine. (November 5.)

COLONIES.

I. (General)—Parliamentary and municipal and local representation of trading companies in the Colonies under responsible government. Circular despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, and the replies thereto. (November 5.)

II. (Annual)—No. 371, St. Helena: Report for 1901. (November 7.)

LOCAL RECORDS COMMITTEE.

I. Report of the Committee appointed to inquire as to the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of local records, and as to further measures which it may be advisable to take for the purpose. (November 6.)

II. Appendices. (November 6.)

LAND LAW (IRELAND) (AGRARIAN OUTRAGES).

Return for the quarter ended 30th September, 1902. (November 7.)

WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA (ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1902-1903).

Statement showing approximately the revised amounts now required under the various Votes in view of the conclusion of peace as compared with the provision made in the estimates submitted to Parliament; with explanations of the difference. (November 7.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).

Four Orders in Council, dated 3rd November, 1902, for holding winter assizes in Ireland.

SUPERANNUATION (PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS).

Treasury minute, dated 1st November, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Professor of Agriculture in the Royal College of Science, Dublin, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till Tomorrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 10*th November*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The CLERK at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 4th day of November, That, in the case of the following Bill, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz:—

Osborne Estate Bill.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Cornwall, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the city of Wakefield, the borough of Ossett, and in the townships of Horbury, Lofthouse-with-Carlton, Thorpe, Rothwell, Sandal Magna, Oulton-with-Woodlesford, and in the parishes of Rothwell, East Ardsley, and Outwood in the West Riding of the county of York (Wakefield and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the South Norfolk Light Railway Order, 1898 (South Norfolk Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Crowland and District Light Railways Order, 1898 (Crowland and District Light Railways (Amendment) Order. 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Morley and the urban districts of Birkenshaw, Drighlington, and Gomersal, in the West Riding of the county of York, and for other purposes (Spen Valley and Morley Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1902)[by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Southampton, from Bentley to Bordon (Bentley and Bordon Light Railway Order, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Bill—Position of Non-Aided Church Schools.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether a certificated efficient Church of England school, not aided by a Parliamentary Grant, with average attendance under thirty, is to be regarded in future as a public elementary school; and, if so, whether within or without the provisions of the Education Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The answer is in the negative.

Consular Service Committee.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a Committee is sitting at the Foreign Office to inquire into the distribution of the consular service with a view to the placing of paid Consuls of British nationality in important commercial centres which have arisen since the last re-distribution, and the removal of paid posts from places which have fallen in commercial importance.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) Constant attention is paid to the distribution of the consular service, and the two principles indicated by my hon. and gallant friend are invariably borne in mind, but this is not one of the questions which has been referred to by the Committee mentioned by the hon. Member.

Howden Cleugh Postmaster.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that the postmaster at Howden Cleugh has resigned; and will he say how long has he been there, what has been his remuneration, and how much has been the turnover in that post office; and whether the sum paid bears a proportion to the turnover such as exists in other places of a similar size.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The town sub-postmaster of Howden Cleugh has given notice that he will resign on 31st December next. He was appointed in March, 1899, at a salary of £5 a year, which has since been raised to £6 a year; and he receives, besides, a small sum as commission on the sale of postal orders. The business of the office is very small, and the remuneration is fixed according to a scale which governs the emoluments of all town sub-postmasters throughout the country.

"The Parliamentary Debates"—New Contract.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the new contract for printing and publishing Reports of Debates and Proceedings in Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Yes.

Education Bill—Ground Rent Charge on School Buildings.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can say if, where schools have hitherto been built on land for which an annual ground rent has been paid, and such rent has been allowed as a legitimate item of expenditure, such ground rent will in future be looked upon as a charge to be provided by the managers, or will it, as heretofore, be charged to general expenses.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson*) Under Clause 8 (*d*) of the Bill the schoolhouse must be provided by the managers free of any charge for ground-rent, unless it be in respect of the teacher's dwelling-house.

Education Bill—Definition of "Other Bodies."

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask Mr. Attorney General whether the expression "other bodies" in Clause 12, sub-Section (2) (*b*), may be held to include the County Education Committee acting as a body having power under the scheme to co-opt persons of experience in education and persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area for which the local education authority acts.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) I do not think this is what is contemplated by the sub-Section.

Census Returns—Population of Carmarthen.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the population of Carmarthen as given in the last census.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am informed by the Registrar General that the population of the borough of Carmarthen at the last census was 10,025. These figures will be contained in the Census Report of Carmarthenshire, which will be issued in due course; they differ slightly from those given in the preliminary report, which did not include the population of a detached part of the borough.

Irish Local Government Board Inspectors and Auditors.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant a Return of the inspectors and auditors, whether permanent or temporary, under the Irish Local Government Board, giving their names, date of appointment, age at appointment, present salary, and occupation previous to appointment; whether there are at present any vacancies among the auditors or inspectors; and whether he can arrange that in future appointments the claims of union officials of experience and standing will be favourably considered.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Return is in preparation, and will be forwarded to the hon. Member when received. There are at present no vacancies in either position. In filling vacancies on its staff the Board proceeds on the principle of selecting the persons whom it considers best qualified.

Athlone Police—Cost of Medical Attendance on Police Fever Patients.

MR. SULLIVAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a short time ago fever broke out in a police barracks within the poor law union of Athlone; that the constabulary patients in the barracks were attended at the Athlone Fever Hospital at the cost of the ratepayers of the union, and that the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary has refused to pay the account amounting to £58 14s. 9d. for the medical treatment of the police; and, if so, will he state upon what grounds the Inspector General came to this decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The matter is engaging my attention. I will communicate the result of my inquiries to the hon. Member in due course.

Army Special Sanitary Officers.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the proposal to appoint twenty special sanitary officers for the Army has been carried out; if so, will he state to what commands at home or abroad these officers have been or will be appointed; what the nature of their duties will be; and whether, in accordance with the recommendation of the Reorganisation Committee, officers so appointed will be required to hold a diploma in public health.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The matter is under consideration.

2nd Kent Garrison Artillery Volunteers—Armament.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether the guns for the Siege Brigade, Thames Defences, are stored in the Woolwich Arsenal; and whether, in view of the fact that the 2nd Kent Royal Garrison Artillery Volunteers have expended £500 in erecting a drill shed at their Lewisham Headquarters, he will allow the guns intended for this corps to be issued to them at once.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The 6-inch howitzers, which will form the armament the 2nd Kent Royal Garrison Artillery Volunteers are eventually to have, are not yet ready. At the time the howitzers were approved for the corps, the officer commanding was warned that some considerable time must elapse before they would be available for issue.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Royal Army Medical Corps.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Monaghan, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that in the recent annual relief programme for officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps serving in India names of officers only who have completed six years in India are included, he will say if the Indian tour for officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps has been extended to six years.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Indian tour of service for officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps has not been extended to six years. It has, however, not been possible, in consequence of the pressure on the establishment caused by the South African campaign, to arrange for the relief of officers, who will complete an ordinary tour during the present trooping season.

Woolwich Royal Arsenal Paymaster and Collector of Income Tax.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that upon the printed form for the collection of Income Tax, Shedule D, the name of Lieutenant Colonel A. B. Williams appears as Assessor and Collector of Income Duty for the Royal Arsenal; and whether, seeing that this paper is also stamped Pay Office, Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, he can state whether this officer occupies the dual position of collector of Income Tax and paymaster to the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich.

MR. BRODRICK: The facts are as stated, nor is there anything unusual or irregular in such arrangements. They prevent evasion of the due payment of a lawful tax, and I am consequently unable to understand the hon. and gallant Member's objection.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Does this officer receive pay from both appointments?

MR. BRODRICK: I presume so, but I am not aware of the facts.

Royal Military College.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to a letter, Form 106, sent by the Commandant of the Royal Military College to parents and guardians of cadets, in connection with the theft of letters in that establishment; and whether he can make arrangements for cashing crossed cheques in the Royal Military College mess or canteen, and for the safe distribution of letters.

MR. BRODRICK: My attention has been called to the circular in question. I am informed that it would be difficult to keep a stock of ready money in the canteen or in the mess for the purpose of cashing cheques. I may, however, state that a recent arrangement has been made which will render remittances to the cadets practically unnecessary. Arrangements have been made which should ensure the safe distribution of letters.

Somaliland Operations—German Transport for British Troops.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): I wish to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that 700 men of the King's British Central African Rifles were conveyed to Berbera in the subsidised German mail steamer "Bundesrath," and whether there was no available English vessel to transport British troops.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The answer to the question is Yes. The reinforcements from British Central Africa for Somaliland were conveyed by the first available steamer suitable for the purpose. This was the "Bundesrath." The hon. and gallant Gentleman is a member of the Select Committee on the shipping subsidies, and perhaps he is better able than myself to know the circumstances relating to shipping accommodation under the British flag on the East Coast of Africa. I believe the Report of the Committee is shortly expected, and the Government await it with interest. I presume the hon. Gentleman will not expect me to make further inquiries in view of this Report?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Can the noble Lord tell the House whether the "Bundesrath" is the same vessel as that captured for carrying contraband of war to the Boers and released without search or trial by the order of the First Lord of the Admiralty.

[No answer was given.]

India—Disabilities of "Purdanishins."

MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT (Durham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the disadvantages under which "Purdanishins" labour in India; and whether he will consider the advisability of steps being taken to protect them against injustice by permitting competent women to qualify as their legal advisers.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have not had the matter officially before me; the disabilities which the custom of the country imposes upon ladies in the greater part of India in the management of their affairs are, however, well known; and I believe that the Government has had under its consideration some proposals for allowing women to qualify as their legal advisers, but I have not been informed whether any conclusion has been arrived at.

Indian Interests in the Philippine Islands.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Hythe, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the effect upon Indian commercial interests in China of the continuance in the Philippine Islands of a silver standard by the action of the Congress of the United States of America in striking out the gold standard clauses of the Philippines Civil Government Bill; and will he state what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: My attention had not been previously directed to the subject. If the hon. Member is able to inform me of any special circumstances of the case affecting India, I shall be glad to consider them.

Lewes Guy Fawkes Celebration.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the occurrences at Lewes, and especially at Borough, Cliffe, Commercial Square, and Southover, on the 5th November last; and whether any complaint has been received from the Roman Catholic inhabitants of those districts as to the treatment which they received on that occasion.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The answer to both Questions is in the negative.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, according to the local paper, the effigy of His Highness the Pope was burnt?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: That is not a matter for the Department; it is one for the local police to deal with.

South African Shipping Combine.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the action of a number of steamship companies in Liverpool, known as the Conference Lines, in notifying traders that the rate of their freight will be increased as much as 75 per cent. unless they will sign an agreement binding themselves to ship exclusively by them, in which case the present rate will hold good; and whether, in the interest of the commerce of this country, he will take steps to prevent such action.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): At the same time, may I ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists among South African traders in regard to the methods recently adopted by a group of South African shipping companies; and whether, with the view of preventing injury to the trading interests of South Africa, he has taken or intends to take any action in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I will answer the Question put by the hon. Member for Derby, and that put by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy Burghs together, and I assume the former refers to the same matter as the latter. If such an arrangement as that referred to has been made, the Board of Trade would not have power to intervene. I recognise, however, that the matter is one of public interest, and will watch further developments.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): Does the right hon. Gentleman not consider this a system of direct commercial boycotting?

MR. DALZIEL: As to the Board of Trade having no power to intervene, is it not possible for them, if satisfied that discontent exists, to make a recommendation with regard to the subsidy?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The question of subsidy would be a matter for the parties concerned, and not for the Board of Trade.

MR. DALZIEL: They could make a recommendation, surely?

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman prosecute the shipping companies for boycotting?

Butterine Bill.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if it is the intention of the Government to pass this session the Butterine Bill, which was read a second time on 25th June.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I propose to reintroduce the Butterine Bill early next Session, and to take the Second Reading and the reference to a Standing Committee before Easter. I propose at the same time to shorten the period between the passing of the Bill and the date at which it will come into operation.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): May I ask whether, having regard to the feeling expressed by various agricultural bodies, the right hon. Gentleman will introduce the Bill under the title of Adulterated Butter Bill.

MR. HANBURY: Yes, that is my intention.

Canadian Cattle—Restrictions on Importation.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can now state what communications have passed between him and the Minister for Agriculture in Canada under the remit of the Colonial Conference relative to the law under which healthy live cattle imported into this country from Canada are required to be slaughtered at the port of landing; and if he will lay the correspondence, if any, upon the Table of the House.

MR. HANBURY: At an interview with the Canadian representative I undertook to ascertain whether it would be possible, without materially increasing the risk of importing disease, to extend the period of ten days within which cattle arriving at the ports must be slaughtered. This inquiry has now been completed, and I am about to communicate the result to the Canadian authorities. Until the correspondence is complete, it would be premature to publish any part of it.

Foreign-made Pencils in Government Offices.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the progress made in the British manufacture of pencils, he will undertake to reconsider the supply of British-made pencils for the telegraph service.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Yes, Sir, I am inquiring into this matter.

Wages of Belfast Postmen.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he will state why the maximum wage of Belfast postmen only rises to 28s. per week, whereas the postmen of Dublin rise to 30s.; and will he state under what class the Belfast Post Office would require to come to receive the same consideration.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The rate of wages in force for postmen at Dublin is confined to a few of the largest and most important postal centres in the United Kingdom, namely, Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester in England, Edinburgh and Glasgow in Scotland, and Dublin in Ireland. The circumstances of Belfast do not bring it within this very limited category, and it is accordingly included in the class of towns at which the next scale is paid, comprising places such as Bristol, Leeds, Newcastle-on-Tyne, etc.

Irish and Welsh Languages in the Post Office.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he can state what is the nature of the rule in Wales requiring Post Office officials to have a knowledge of the Welsh language; and what is the proportion of English to Welsh speaking people in any postal district where the officials are not required to know the two languages.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There is no rule on this subject; but in appointing postmasters to places in Wales where the district surveyor reports that the knowledge of Welsh is necessary it is the practice to select only a candidate who possesses it. I am not able to state the proportion of English to Welsh speaking people in any postal district.

Mr. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman give similar instructions to the surveyors in Ireland?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I see no reason for that.

The Hill of Tara.

Mr. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will say by whose authority excavations have been carried out at the historic mounds on the Hill of Tara; and whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps to preserve these historical memorials from destruction.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The excavations were carried out under the authority of the owner of the land. They were stopped by him in June last, and have not since, I believe, been renewed. It is eminently desirable that these ancient monuments should be preserved, and I shall be glad to take any steps within my power to that end. I cannot, however, as at present advised, undertake to introduce legislation.

Middleton Guardians—Use of Board-room.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can state under what authority the Middleton Board of Guardians are sued for permitting the use of their board-room for political meetings seeing that these rooms are used for meetings of creamery and co-operative societies; and whether there has been any precedent for similar legal proceedings.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The suit is founded on an alleged breach of trust by the guardians as public trustees. The Crown contend that the case is covered by the authority of many decided and reported cases, but as the proceedings are pending I must decline to enter further into particulars.

Belfast Infirmary.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a child was born in Belfast Infirmary on 10th February, and received medical treatment by the dispensary doctor from March until it died on 9th April; and can he state on what grounds the doctor refused certificate of death for the burial of the child for three days.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The last occasion on which the dispensary doctor examined the child was the 1st April. He refused to certify the cause of death on 9th April since he had not seen the child in the interval. The ailment from which it suffered on 1st April could not have been the cause of death. The doctor reported the facts to the Registrar General, who informed him that his action was correct.

Marine Works (Ireland) Act.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any allocations of the moneys voted by Parliament under the Marine Works (Ireland) Act has yet been made; and, if not, when will he be able to give this information to the House. I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Dingal County Council has passed a Resolution agreeing to guarantee a portion of the money required for the construction of a pier and harbour at Portnaling (North Donegal), in accordance with the provisions of the Marine Works (Ireland) Act; and will he give a grant out of the moneys at his disposal for the carrying out of this project.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No allocation of the money placed at the disposal of Government by the recent Act has yet taken place. Correspondence is still proceeding; but it is hoped that the Government will be in a position to give effect to the provisions of the statute at an early date.

"Future" Tenants in County Leitrim.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on how many estates in the county Leitrim future tenants have been created since the Land Act of 1881, and the number of them; and whether he would be prepared to receive a deputation from these future tenants with a view to having their rights safeguarded under any future land purchase legislation.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of notices served under Section 7 of the Act of 1887, not the Act of 1881, to the present date was 2,761. The number of actual evictions in the same period was 410. The effect of a notice being to determine the tenancy, the tenant must redeem before he can apply to have a fair rent fixed. Such redemptions are, it is believed, frequent, but there are no official records showing their number. I do not perceive the connection between Future Tenancies and Land Purchase, since, in that respect, a future tenant stands in the same position as a present tenant. If the hon. Member will indicate the points which the deputation wishes to submit, I will consider his request.

Irish Clerks of Unions—Franchise and Jurors Rolls.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of boards of guardians have passed resolutions approving of having the work under the Franchise Acts and Jurors Acts performed by the clerks of unions, who are in touch with the people; and whether, in view of the amount of the salaries of clerks of unions appointed since 1899, and in order to obtain competent and efficient men for these positions, he will be prepared to deal with the question of the transfer of these duties under The Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: Resolutions have been passed, as stated. By the operation of the Local Government Act of 1898, the assessing and levying of rates devolved upon County and Urban District Councils. As a necessary consequence the duties in relation to the registration of electors and to jurors' lists were transferred to the responsible officers of the new rating authorities. These officers are in direct touch with the rate collectors upon whom the successful preparation of the lists largely depends, and who are under the control of the County Council. It is not proposed to disturb the existing arrangements.

MR. TULLY: Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that the duty of checking the rate books is performed by clerks of Unions?

MR. WYNDHAM: This matter has been brought before me several times, and I do not propose to make any change.

Explosives Bye-Laws.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to complaints as to the bye-laws against certain explosives put in force by the Pembroke Urban Council; and whether he can state on what ground the Local Government Board gave their sanction to these bye-laws.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board is not required to sanction bye-laws made under the Explosives Act, nor were any such bye-laws submitted to the Board by the local authority referred to. I am making further inquiry in the matter.

MR. TULLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these bye-laws are directed against Christmas crackers etc., and will he not put an end to such an absurdity?

[No answer was returned.]

Hatley Bridge across the Shannon.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the inconvenience created by the want of a bridge across the Shannon at Hatley, near Carrick-on-Shannon; and whether he can state on what terms the Board of Works would be prepared to advance a loan to the local Councils in Roscommon and Leitrim for the construction of this bridge.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners of Public Works are empowered to lead for such term of years, not exceeding fifty, as the country may be authorised to borrow for. The rates of interest are $3\frac{1}{4}$, $3\frac{1}{2}$ and $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. for terms not exceeding thirty, forty and fifty years, respectively.

British Orders and Decorations.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will agree to a Return showing the British orders of knighthood, decorations, honorific distinctions, crosses and medals now in existence, with the respective dates of their institution; and whether His Majesty's Ministers are responsible for the grant of peerages and baronetcies, and the distribution of the orders and other honorific distinctions in question.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I venture to depreciate my hon. friend's request for this official information. As I have said before in answer to a Question of his, these inquiries are so closely connected with the Prerogative of the Crown that I am disposed to think it better not to make them a subject of Question and Answer in the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the Prerogatives of the Crown have been frequently discussed in the debates of this House for 800 years?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, and they may be again; but I do not think anything is gained by Question and Answer upon the subject.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the second part of the Question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is the second part which perhaps more closely touches upon the subject.

The Permanent Secretary to the Board of Education.

MR. DALZIEL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Sir George Kekewich has been required to resign the office of Permanent Secretary to the Board of Education; and, if so, will he say who has been appointed as his successor, how long his successor has been in the service of the Board of Education, and what posts in that service he has filled.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Under the regulations which govern the Board of Education, officers of all ranks who reach the age of sixty-two are required to retire, in the absence of special circumstances. Sir George Kekewich will reach that limit of age in April next. As from April 1st an entirely new system of administration will commence, it was deemed desirable in the public interest to entrust this establishment to the officer who will continue to direct it. In these circumstances it was not possible to extend Sir George Kekewich's service beyond the limits fixed by the regulations; but this casts no reflection on an able public servant, who will retire on the *maximum* rate of pension after a long and distinguished public career. Mr. Morant will succeed Sir George Kekewich as head of the office and, in the meantime, has been appointed Acting Secretary. Mr. Morant was appointed to the Board of Education in 1895 on the occasion of the establishment of a new branch of work in the office. He was appointed senior examiner in 1900. Mr. Morant has spent the whole of his life in the active prosecution of educational work both in England and abroad, and I am satisfied that not only is he amply qualified for this post, but that his appointment has proved generally acceptable to all persons who are interested in educational progress and have a practical acquaintance with educational organisation.

The Brussels Convention.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman can give the House any information as to public business, and I would take this opportunity to ask him whether the Brussels Convention is likely to be brought forward soon, and when. I should also like to know whether due notice will be given as to when it will be brought forward.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Two days.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We hope to take that matter between the Committee and the Report stages of the Education Bill, and I shall endeavour to give full notice.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Can the right hon. Gentleman say in what form the financial resolution which will be necessary to authorise the expenditure will be introduced?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am informed that no financial resolution will be introduced. I cannot, of course, discuss the matter now, but as I understand it, the resolution which is to be brought forward in connection with the Convention is not one that requires action on the part of the House in Committee of the Whole House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Convention provides for certain absolute and inevitable expenditure?

[No answer was returned.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—INDIAN BUDGET DEBATE.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: Can the Prime Minister say if the Indian Budget debate is not concluded by 7.30, what course he proposes to take with regard to the evening sitting?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There will be no serious objection to its being continued at the evening sitting provided it is understood that we shall have time to take the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. I do not think that that ought to take long.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): But the right hon. Gentleman promised that the Appropriation Bill should be the first Order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I think there was no public arrangement to that effect.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It was stated so.

MR. DALZIEL: If Indian questions are still under discussion at 11 p.m. is it proposed to move the adjournment in order to take the Consolidation Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give an absolute pledge as to the course that will be pursued, but I think that probably that will be the most convenient plan.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Before deciding to take the Appropriation Bill this evening, will the right hon. Gentleman look at it and see if it is a proper Appropriation Bill and does not require serious amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I presume my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has looked into that more closely than I have.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will the Appropriation Bill be first or second Order tonight?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Second.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order for Committee read.

*(2.35.) THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): At the late period of the session at which we have arrived, when it is my duty to submit the annual statement on behalf of the Indian Government, there is brought with it a certain advantage of which I hope I shall be able to take advantage. There seems to be a tendency of certain sections of the House, which may perhaps accurately be described as the Indian Opposition, to treat the forecasts of the Secretary of State with regard to Indian Revenue with incredulity. They have been described over and over again as the fantastic concoctions of a phenomenal optimist, an official who is, as to the state of Indian affairs, up in a balloon, who has no cognisance or true appreciation of the wants of India; and it has been urged, therefore, that these estimates should have no weight attached to them. Every successive year shows, when we close the accounts, and when the figures are known, that, if the Indian Secretary has erred at all, it is not by being too sanguine. Of the three years to which I shall refer we have indisputable figures for two years and eight months, therefore the forecast of the estimates can only deal with the estimates for four months of this triennial period.

The first year with which I have to deal is that which terminated on 1st April, 1901. I originally estimated that the outcome of our finances would show a deficit of £826,000. The drought was terribly prevalent throughout certain portions of India. It caused enormous direct and indirect losses to the Revenue. My statement as to our capacity to meet the situation thus created was received with incredulity—I will not say by a section of the House, but by all Gentlemen on the other side of the House—and they moved a resolution to the effect that, in order to enable the Indian Government to fulfil its responsibilities, a grant of £5,000,000 should be made from the Imperial Revenue. We contested that proposal, and now we have the final outcome of this year. Instead of the deficit, we have a surplus of £1,670,000. But something more has to be said. In this year there were enormous profits from the minting of rupees. Formerly these profits have been credited to revenue, but this year I established a surplus gold reserve fund out of the profits, which amounted to £3,100,000; so that if you add the figures together you will see that there will be a surplus of nearly £5,000,000. May I ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to consider what the effect would have been of the financial arrangements which they intended to have carried into effect? They proposed to add £5,000,000 to the existing £50,000,000 deficit of Imperial finance, in order to double the surplus accruing to the Indian Exchequer. The next year with which I have to deal is that terminating April, 1902. Originally the surplus was estimated at £690,000. When I spoke last year we had sufficient behind us to justify a revised estimate of a surplus of £1,824,000. I then gave my reasons after entering into an elaborate analysis of the various industries in India, of its trade and commerce, for the belief that there was a certain revival of general prosperity. That statement was received with even greater incredulity than had been previously displayed, and from that time to now I have been inundated with letters, pamphlets and even books, that have been written to show the fatuity and ineptitude of our calculation. These letters, books, and what-not have been consigned, even by those who wrote them, to the waste-paper basket ["No, no,"] because my modest estimate of a surplus of £1,824,000 has achieved the grand dimensions of £4,900,000. But it is only fair I should add that we had a windfall in this year by the employment of a certain number of troops on the Indian Establishment in South Africa and China.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): Over £3,000,000.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: My estimate is that the saving amounted to about £1,000,000 sterling, but the greater proportion of that sum has been spent in re-arming the native Army and improving the efficiency of the Army. But what is more important, in connection with this year, is that there was an increase under every head of revenue, and notably under Customs and railroads, which, in every country except India, is taken to mean that there is every indication of a revival of trade, both internal and external. Now, Sir, I turn to the last year—the current year. We had clear evidence before us, in considering this Budget, that, assuming the basis of taxation and of expenditure remained the same, there would be a considerable margin of income over expenditure, and we carefully considered to what purpose we should apply this margin—whether we should apply it to a re-adjustment or remission of taxation, or whether we should make special grants to those industries and those provinces and those branches of administration which had suffered so severely during the long protracted drought and distress. We came to the conclusion that the best use which we could make of this margin was to make these special grants, and we, therefore, charged the finance of this year, partly by a reduction of income, and partly by an increase of expenditure, with a sum of £1,500,000. But we estimated that, after we had made this special charge, we should have a surplus of about £837,000. I am glad to say that the year has sufficiently advanced for me to assert that the surplus, at the very least, will exceed £1,700,000.

Now, Sir, just let me review the finances of these three years. They are not normal years, because during the whole period there has been great distress in the western part of India, which is the richest portion of our Indian Empire. We have had very heavy disbursements to make to meet famine distress, and we have also had to meet curtailment of our industries. The upshot is that, after meeting all expenditure, we have realised a surplus of £8,300,000. We have during that interval spent 20 millions sterling upon railroads, and two millions sterling upon irrigation; and we have, in addition, established a special gold fund for the purpose of giving stability to exchange, of which no less than £3,600,000 is invested here in Consols in the name of the Secretary of State. I think that all—even my most prejudiced critics—must regard these as remarkable financial results to achieve, and they are the more remarkable if we throw back our recollections to what were the conditions of Indian finance at the time when the Crown took over the territories of the East India Company. The prospects of the finance of the new Government were then indeed gloomy. The Mutiny had been suppressed at great cost, and a large Debt had been incurred in consequence. For the maintenance of order and authority it was essential that there should be a vast increase of the white forces that previously had been stationed in India. This entailed a very heavy increased charge for military purposes, and, in association with this increase of white troops there was an enormous capital outlay in providing the necessary accommodation. The East India Company had some years back entered into arrangements with a number of companies for the purpose of constructing railroads at a very high rate of guaranteed interest, and it was a matter of certainty that for years to come, though they might develop the trade and agriculture of the country, they would be worked at a financial loss to the State. If the East India Company transferred all these financial liabilities to the Crown, they also transferred the services of two eminent financiers — Sir Thomas Seccombe and Sir Henry Waterfield. Sir Thomas Seccombe at once assumed the position of chief financial adviser of the Secretary of State for India. For twenty-two years he held that position. During that time he contrived, by his indomitable energy and knowledge of finance, to assist every Finance Minister in India. Little by little the yawning gap between income and expenditure was diminished, until ultimately Sir Thomas Seccombe succeeded in establishing more than an equilibrium, and when he retired the credit as well as the stability of Indian finance was restored. He was succeeded by Sir Henry Waterfield, who had been trained under him. Sir Henry Waterfield also held the office for twenty-two years, and had great difficulties to deal with. The great fall in the price of silver immensely increased the number of rupees that had to be provided in India to meet the obligations of the Indian Government in this country, and the Government's finance had again to pass through a most serious ordeal. We have emerged from that, and Sir Henry Waterfield then had to deal with six years of successive drought and famine. Notwithstanding this, under Sir Henry Waterfield's advice and guidance, our financial system has arrived at such a condition that I am enabled to state to the House the gratifying figures I have just mentioned. Sir Henry Waterfield and Sir Thomas Seccombe are admirable specimens of the permanent Civil servants to which this country owes so much. I doubt if in the long record of the Civil Service there has ever been another instance of two men, in combination, holding the responsible position of financial adviser for forty-four years. Their names will be inseparably associated with the resuscitation of the credit and finance of India, which is so largely due to their respective efforts.

Now, Sir, it is asserted that, even if the results of our financial system are satisfactory on paper, they have been achieved at terrible cost to the population on whom that system has been imposed; that the population under our rule in India has been slowly bled to death, and is steadily deteriorating in material prosperity. On these assertions, which are frequently made, I have only two observations to make. The first is that if a man's income year by year increases, nobody can contend that by that process he is getting poorer. The second is that if. under any system of taxation imposed on a community, the taxation remains steady, and the proceeds of this taxation year by year increase, it is universally accepted as evidence that the burden of taxation is lightening, and not pressing heavier on the communities who bear it. But whilst I deny—as a grotesque libel—the statement that the masses of those under our rule in India have gone back in material prosperity, I admit readily that India is a very poor country, that there are dense masses of poverty located there, that the partition between the ordinary wage of the coolie and indigence is very thin, and that their general standard of life and comfort is far below that of European nations. And I admit that, not from over-assessment, but from certain mistakes which I think have been associated with our land assessment, there is a great increase in the indebtedness of the cultivating classes; and, therefore, these facts should always be present to us when we are considering the financial system in India. I propose tonight to indulge in the somewhat prosaic ordeal of taking each great head of taxation, and estimating its future probabilities placing these against the corresponding probabilities of expenditure, in order that we may be able to form some opinion of what the future prospects of Indian finance and of the Indian taxpayers may be.

The first big item of income with which I will deal is that relating to Customs. Now there has been a steady growth of the Customs revenue, and that growth has been associated with the articles which the poorer classes in India consume. The external trade during the year 1900–1901 reached the highest figures known. Both the imports and the exports were largely in excess of those of any preceding year, and a still further increase of considerable dimensions was shown in 1901–1902. I quite admit that the external trade of India bears nothing like the same relation to the internal trade as the relation between the external trade and internal trade of this country—the vast mass of the population are not affected by it. Still, large numbers of the community are engaged in it, and so far as it affects them any substantial increase is conclusive evidence of increase both in their power of production and their power of consumption. In 1891–92 the total external trade was £130,000,000. Ten years later, those figures had advanced to £163,000,000, showing an increase of £33,000,000 during this period. I think, therefore, we may look upon Customs as an absolutely stable and increasing source of revenue, and, unless some alteration is made in the rates, it is certain over a series of years to give us a successive series of increases.

I now come to railroads. For many years the railway system in India was worked at a loss to the revenue, but during the last three years there has been a remarkable development in the receipts, so that we may confidently rely in the future upon its being a rapidly increasing source of income. In 1891, our railways had an open mileage of 17,300 miles, and the capital associated with this open mileage was £151,000,000. Ten years later, the open mileage had reached 25,300 miles and the capital £228,000,000. Inasmuch as the earlier railways were laid through the richer and more densely populated parts of India, while the latter traversed the poorer districts, and many of them were promoted quite as much for military as for other reasons, it might be supposed that the return on the larger mileage and expenditure would be less than on the smaller. But such is not the case. Whereas, in the earlier period, there was a loss of £458,000 (including interest), in the latter period there was a profit of £795,000. But that figure does not convey a full sense of the difference. The Indian Government have the option—which in almost every case has been exercised—of purchasing all the old guaranteed railways at certain periods by terminable annuities, which carry with them a sinking fund for the redemption of capital. Those annuities do not now run for a longer period than fifty years, and the whole of this sinking fund is charged annually against the ordinary railway revenue account. Therefore, there is silently at work a sinking fund which will automatically bring into the possession of the Indian Government, fifty years hence, a magnificent property valued at £80,000,000 or £100,000,000 sterling, and the whole revenue annually derived from it will go for the benefit of the Indian Exchequer. The Indian Government have been compelled themselves to construct, either through guaranteed companies or directly, nearly all the railroads existing in India, and they annually devote a sum, which varies, from revenue towards the construction of these railways. The process which takes place is that each year the amount devoted from revenue to the construction of reproductive railways is deducted from the permanent debt, and transferred to the capital account of the railway. So there is constantly going on a two-fold process—the reduction of debt which is non-productive, and the increase of capital which is productive. The result has been very remarkable during the last ten years; because, although the capital of the productive debt has largely increased, the receipts are so great that they far more than counterbalance the increased interest which has to be paid on the larger capital. Taking again the same period, I find at the commencement (1891) that the service of non-productive debt was at £2,450,000, and in ten years it has been diminished to £1,487,000. The charge against revenue for railways; irrigation works, and other commercial services at the commencement of the period was £1,500,000. At the close of the period these services gave a profit of £800,000. The result is, therefore, that taking the charge for non-productive debt and productive capital outlay during these ten years, the Indian Government have improved their position by a reduction of the general charge on the Indian revenue of about £3,300,000. This is an item which I will ask the House to consider in connection with the growth of general expenditure of the Indian Government. It shows that we can count on the Indian railways producing an increasing source of income for years to come.

I turn to what is the most important source of revenue at the disposal of the Indian Government—namely, the land revenue. The Indian Government have the right of landlord over all the land of India, and from time immemorial it has been the practice of whatever Government is in existence in India to exact in the exercise of that right a certain proportion of the produce of the land, no matter what the form of ownership or occupation may be. I believe there is not a single one of the forms of ownership or of land occupation in existence throughout the world, which does not in some shape find a reproduction in India. Consequently it has been impossible to lay down any very general principle or formula as to the proportion of produce which, under all these varying forms of tenure, the Government should be entitled to obtain. Upon the moderation and the equitable enforcement of our land assessment depends the development and progress of the cultivators of the soil, who certainly constitute the overwhelming proportion of the population of India, and upon whose contentment and prosperity to a large extent depends the stability of our rule in India. It is, therefore, of paramount importance that our assessments should be moderate in themselves, and that our method of enforcing them should be equitable. During the protracted period of distress and drought through which the country has passed, doubts were expressed in certain quarters as to the equitable nature of these assessments; and a certain gentleman, Mr. Romesh Dutt, stated the proposition that the primary cause of distress and famine in India was not want of rain, but over-assessment on the part of the Indian Government. This expression of opinion took shape finally in a series of letters written by Mr. Romesh Dutt and addressed to myself and the Viceroy. Several gentlemen interested in the question of land tenure also wrote on the subject. Mr. Romesh Dutt not only denounced the assessments which the Government had imposed, but also suggested what he thought would be an equitable settlement, and a scale which, in future, the Government should exact. Lord Curzon, with characteristic promptitude, at once took up the challenge. The question has always been under the consideration of the local governments; and, after consultation with them, Lord Curzon issued a singularly able and lucid resolution in the first month of this year which dealt fully with the various contentions advanced; and he showed conclusively that the allegations as to over-assessment were quite unreasonable; and that, if the Government accepted Mr. Romesh Dutt's own estimate of what was just, the assessment in many parts of India would have to be doubled. But the Viceroy, while proving the moderation of the assessments, very wisely associated in the resolution a statement with regard to certain principles which had been always in operation, but which certainly would not have been less effectively in operation if universally known. He expressed the strong desire of the Indian Government in favour of long term settlements, and against sudden and great enhancements; and dealt with the principle of assessing improvements. But if it were true that assessments were not too high, it may also be asserted that in some parts of the country they were too rigidly enforced; that there was not sufficient elasticity in the methods by which they were collected. Therefore, Lord Curzon expressed, on behalf of the Indian Government, the desirability of a more elastic policy of revision and collection; so that, whenever local deterioration could be shown, remission should not be to the individual, but general to the whole district. The Government of Bombay, which is the part which has most suffered from distress, are about to introduce a Bill for the purpose of giving effect to this idea.

The unpleasant feature connected with our system of land assessment is undoubtedly the increase in the indebtedness of the cultivator. There was an idea prevalent amongst certain very distinguished Indian administrators that the great object of land assessment should be, not only to be equitable in the amount levied, but to be rigid in the enforcement of the assessment. It was thought that it would teach the cultivator thrift and economy, and it was assumed that, if he were unable to pay, he would probably be bought out by a better cultivator, and that thus, under this process of rigid enforcement, you would develop a stronger and stronger race of cultivators. They were further of opinion that it was most advantageous that the cultivator should have full opportunities of obtaining assistance in the cultivation of his land. The result has not been satisfactory. The moneylenders have come in, and have given to each individual cultivator, in consequence of the lowness of assessment, such facilities for borrowing that they have in many cases availed themselves of them so far as to be absolutely in the hands of those from whom they have borrowed. We have established a system of Courts by which the moneylender has increased facilities of obtaining the repayment of money advanced; and the consequence has been that so far from bringing capital into agriculture, they have become absolute master of certain parts of India, of the holdings as well as the persons of those who cultivate it. Therefore, I think that, whatever the moral we draw, we should not be too hasty in introducing into India ideas and principles which, although they work very well here, may not necessarily bear the same fruit when all the surrounding conditions are entirely different. The hon. Member for Camborne in the last speech he made last year laid stress on the advisability of providing some system of conciliation by which the creditor, the debtor, and an official might meet together, and some equitable arrangement might be arrived at by which the cultivator might be free from the burden of his debt. Mr. Fraser, the Chief Commissioner of one of the districts which has suffered during the recent visitations of drought, has put in practice this idea, and the results have been extraordinarily satisfactory. He made a speech not long ago to those engaged in this work—to the officer in charge, to the creditors, and to the landlords and the tenants. I have not the document with me, but the purport is this—that a very large amount of debt had voluntarily been remitted, and that there was no friction or controversy between the landlord and tenant in that part of the country. The conclusion he has arrived at is this—a sound one—if the Government show a spirit of generosity in not enforcing during bad times land assessments, probably those to whom the cultivators are otherwise indebted will follow the example thus shown.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): Will the noble Lord lay the Paper on the Table?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I will.

MR. CAINE: I thank you.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Therefore I think, assuming that our assessments in future are on the side of moderation, we may confidently calculate that the land revenue will, as the country opens, continue not only to be stable, but to increase. I need not say much as to stamps, Excise, and assessed taxes. All these branches of revenue show a slight increase. As they stood by us in the past and in time of trouble, we can, I think, rely upon them to give us an increasing income in normal times for the future. Opium, on the other hand, shows a falling off. Many years ago, when the first discussion took place on the opium revenue—I believe I was Under Secretary for India at the time—the contention was advanced that it was entirely due to the introduction of Indian opium into China that they were an opium consuming population. I was able to show that in those parts of China to which Indian opium had not penetrated the largest amount of opium was cultivated and consumed. The opium revenue has been of great service to India, but it has fallen off greatly of recent years. Twenty years ago it brought in a net revenue of about £6,000,000, but in recent years it has only given us about £3,000,000 sterling. It is not absolutely a reliable source of income. Possibly it may diminish in the future, but it is satisfactory to know that it is each year forming a less proportion of the revenue which is at the disposal of the Indian Government.

I now come to a tax which excites a good deal of attention in this country—the salt tax. Looking at the figures connected with this tax, I cannot say that the conclusions which one draws from them are very satisfactory. Receipts from it increase very slowly, though I am told that this year there is a considerable development. If we take the consumption of salt in connection with the immense development of railroads and the increased facilities of transmission and distribution, the development in consumption is very small. Therefore I think that one must arrive at one of two conclusions—either the people do not want to increase their consumption of salt or the tax prevents them from doing so. I incline to the latter theory. Lord Curzon informs me that, though he has had very many petitions on almost every conceivable subject he scarcely ever receives a petition connected with the salt tax. I believe the tax is viewed by the natives with very different feelings from those which prevail among certain sections of opinion in this House. It would be useless to touch the salt tax unless a great slice could be taken off, and we are obliged to be very cautious in the action which we take if it involves the surrender of a considerable amount of income. My hon. friend behind me, who has had considerable experience of the East, knows that, if a mistake is made by those who are responsible for the finances of this conntry, it is not possible to make good the deficiency that is caused by putting a penny on the income-tax or raising a duty on an article of general consumption. The deficit would probably remain, and the Government would have difficulty in making it good. Therefore we have to act very cautiously in connection with this tax; but I own that the feeling which always influences me is—I believe you would, by reducing it, increase the consumption, and if you increase the consumption you then get a financial reserve always possible in a time of emergency to raise by a tax on this increase of consumption. It is not possible, at any rate, for me to say anything now in relation to this tax. There are other taxes which have also to be raised by the Indian Government, and it would be quite out of place if I were now to indicate, assuming hereafter that we were to reduce taxation, the direction that that reduction should take.

Summing up, I may say that our sources of revenue, with the exception of opium, are increasing, and there is, therefore, every reasonable likelihood if we can keep expenditure down, that there will be for the future a considerable margin of income over expenditure.

Let me turn now to expenditure. When I came first into his House, many years ago, there was a fashionable theory among hon. Members that if the expenditure of the Government was to be checked it could be best done by putting it under the control of a representative Assembly which was elected on a democratic basis. That was the argument brought forward by Mr. Fawcett and others; and for this reason it was contended that the House of Commons should exercise more control over Indian finances than it did when they were under the direction of a Government which was necessarily autocratic in its composition, but in which the military element was, to a certain extent, predominant. I do not know whether that view any longer prevails as to democratic Assemblies; but, if there be any who still believe in this old fable, it may be useful to mention the growth of expenditure during the ten years under this military autocracy in India and the growth of expenditure under the supervision of representative democracy in this country. [An HON. MEMBER on the Opposition Benches:—"Tory Government."] I take the years between 1891 and 1901. The civil and military Estimates of Great Britain (exclusive of Debt Services) amounted at the end of the decade in 1891 to £50,950,000; now they are £84,900,000, showing an increase of £34,000,000. In India at the beginning of that period the Civil and Military Estimates and general administration amounted to £32,000,000; at the close they were £35,600,000, showing an increase of £3,600,000. But the House will recollect that I showed that in consequence of judicious development of railroads and the constant transfer of sums from non-productive capital to productive capital, in respect of these two items the Indian Government had improved their position during the ten years by £3,300,000, and if you deduct this from the excess of £3,600,000, the Indian Government have accomplished the creditable task of carrying on the Civil and Military Government, improving the efficiency of both, with an increase to the taxpayer of £300,000.

Can we hope to be able to continue this improved administration? There are certain items which it is perfectly clear we shall have to increase. We shall have to increase our expenditure in connection with education, in police administration, and the amount allotted to the local governments in respect of provincial contracts. The claims on the local administration as civilisation develops are greater and greater, and they can only be legitimately met by making some increase of their resources. But I cannot hold out any hope of reduction of expenditure as regards our Army. I hope the increase may not be large or substantial, but I think it is not improbable that we may have to add, to a certain extent, to the number of white troops in India. We have been fortunate during the past three years in obtaining large sums from the Imperial Government by loan, and for Imperial purposes, of Indian troops. We ran some risk in so diminishing our military forces in India, but we have benefited financially. We have received about £2,300,000 from the Imperial Exchequer, and we have expended most of it on re-arming the native army with the most modern rifle, in re-arming batteries of artillery, increasing the store of ammunition, and establishing new works for the manufacture of munitions of war in India itself; and the outcome of this expenditure has contributed to the efficiency of the Army, in mobilisation and otherwise. We are fortunate to have obtained the services of Lord Kitchener as commander-in-chief in India. Lord Kitchener is an administrator of the highest quality, and his work is always associated with economy. While I have been anticipating a reduction in certain branches of military expenditure, still I am afraid the demands which science imposes upon us of keeping our troops up to the latest requirements will necessitate some general increase in our military expenditure.

But military expenditure is regulated by policy. Our policy, both along our own frontiers and in the countries contiguous, has neither changed nor varied. Unaggressive in its character, it is based on principles of self-defence, regulated by a vigilant observance of what is going on. The death of the late Ameer Abdurrahman, though it removed a great personality from the rule of Afghanistan, in no way affects the engagements we have entered into with Russia as to the limits of our respective spheres of action, intercourse, and influence, nor the principles underlying the understanding between the ruler of Afghanistan and ourselves. Reviewing, then, the factors on both sides of the account it will be seen that, unless there is some abnormal expenditure forced upon us, our existing income, with the annual increments that may be anticipated, will so far exceed the demands upon it as to leave a margin available either for the readjustment or remission of taxation, or for extra grants to localities, services, or local governments which are in special want of such assistance. But on this occasion it would be altogether premature to express an opinion on the question to which of these purposes that margin may hereafter be applied.

There is one group of subjects on which I should like to say a few words. They are subjects which have attracted a great deal of public attention, and which arise from controversies which periodically crop up between the Imperial and Indian

Exchequers. They relate to the apportionment of charges in connection with services in which both countries have a joint but a varying and unequal interest, or they arise in connection with questions where the limit between Indian and Imperial interest is not very clearly defined; or at other times they have their origin in military charges, where a Department supplying articles and men which are indispensable to the Indian Government has the power of regulating the price at which those articles can be obtained. The first and most important of these questions is the cost of expeditions which are sent from India to places outside the Indian Empire. On this subject I think a very strong feeling exists, both in this House and outside, that India should be treated with the utmost consideration. I wrote some years back to the Treasury making certain suggestions, and endeavouring to lay down this principle—that, whereas within a certain sphere and for certain objects, India might be considered interested, outside those spheres and objects any expedition sent from India ought to have its cost exclusively defrayed from the Imperial Exchequer. The Royal Commission which was appointed to enquire into Indian Expenditure took up my suggestions and amplified them, and drew up an elaborate scheme, discriminating between those zones and those objects which in their judgment were Imperial, partly Imperial and partly Indian, and wholly Indian. We sent that document on from the India Office to the Treasury, and the late Chancellor of the Exchequer at once agreed to accept the principle which was embodied in that document. During the past three years India has sent expeditions to China, South Africa, Jubaland, and other parts of Africa, and in every single instance, without demur, the whole cost of that expedition has been thrown upon the Imperial Exchequer. But in connection with operations of this kind disputes may arise as to questions of changes. I therefore asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to agree to the principle of arbitration. He readily assented, and the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Alverstone, has kindly undertaken, for three years to come, to arbitrate on questions that may arise as to the division of charges between the Imperial and Indian Exchequers that can be referred to arbitration. Then there was a proposal, made by the Royal Commission, that, for the purpose of putting on an equitable footing Indian and Imperial expenditure, there should be a transfer of a charge of £260,000 from the Indian to the Imperial Estimates. To this the late Chancellor of the Exchequer gave a prompt assent. That sum was so transferred last year, and it will in all subsequent years be a permanent reduction of the requirements which were made upon the Indian Treasury. The most difficult of these controversies are those which arise in connection with military charges In other questions the two parties, that is to say, the India Office and the Treasury, represent two independent Exchequers, over which the chief of each Department has absolute control; but when we have to deal with the War Office the relations between ourselves and the War Office assume another aspect. We must have a certain number of British soldiers in India, and the only Department which can supply them is the War Office. I think it is almost universally admitted that it would not be possible for India to supply her own wants in this respect. The ordinary practice of the War Office is only to charge us the cost price of that which is supplied. From time to time, however, military considerations of an Imperial character arise, and these may involve an increase in the pay of the British soldier, even although the change which necessitates the increase may not be one which India herself would require. It is exceedingly difficult for India to refuse to accept the increased charge when it takes the form of pay. India cannot refuse to the British soldier the rate of pay which he obtains in other parts of the Empire. Such a case arose the other day in connection with the system of recruiting which my right hon. friend the Minister for War has adopted. He proposed to raise the pay of recruits by 2d. for the first three years, and by 6d. more if they remained a longer period with the colours. We agreed to pay the extra 2d., but we demurred to paying the extra 6d., and we gave reasons for doing so. The change was, in our opinion, more beneficial to Imperial than to Indian interests, and the whole cost of it should not, we thought, be put on the Indian revenues. The War Office, I am sorry to say, would not accept the validity of our contention, and I have requested that the question should be referred to arbitration on the principle of which I have already spoken. This course has been agreed to. I have an apology to make to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. I told him some time back that I hoped to be able, before the Indian Budget came on, to lay Papers before the House. There has been some delay in getting certain information, and the Papers in question do not deal with the particular matter in which the right hon. Baronet is most interested—the best period of service for India. That question is only raised indirectly, the argument being mainly financial.

Now I come to the last of these questions, the smallest in amount, but one which, perhaps, has excited more interest than even the other two—namely, the cost of the entertainment of visitors from India who come as public guests to this country. As the original arrangement, to which both I and the Council of India and the Government of India were parties, has been very severely criticised in certain quarters, perhaps I may be allowed to explain what were the conditions then existing which alone induced us to agree to this arrangement. When East India was transferred to the Crown it was transferred subject to all the conditions which then existed — conditions which were sanctioned by long practice and tradition—one of which was that when a distinguished person came from India as a visitor his expenses were to be defrayed out of the Indian revenue. Last year His Majesty's Government appointed an inter-Departmental Committee to consider the scale upon which the Coronation should be celebrated and the number of visitors who should be invited. We were engaged at the time in a most serious war, taxation was heavy, and a large deficit was impending. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government came to the conclusion that they would not be justified in sanctioning more than an expenditure of £100,000 for the purpose. The Committee who examined the question found, however, that if there were a rigid adherence to that sum it would not be possible to give that adequate representation to India which we thought was desirable, and which she was entitled to. I was therefore faced by this alternative. I must either acquiesce in a reduction of the number of visitors, which would have caused great heart-burning and political discontent, or I must revert to the old practice of selecting those whom we wished to come, and pay that portion of their expenses which came over and above the £100,000. The Indian Council, after full consideration, came to the conclusion that we should have full control as to the number of visitors to be asked. I referred the matter to the Indian Government, which very reluctantly came to the same conclusion. But the whole circumstances under which these arrangements were made were changed when peace was proclaimed. The unfortunate illness of His Majesty increased the cost of these entertainments and hospitality, and, therefore, I wrote and made further representations on the subject to the Treasury, and asked them to reverse their decision under the changed conditions, and they promptly responded that the whole of the expenditure would be defrayed from the Imperial revenue. The question of the scale of hospitality and entertainment to be given to the Indian visitors was not so easy to settle as outsiders assumed. The scale, especially as regards the great princes, is higher than that allowed by Treasury regulations in this country. The hospitality which the native Indian princes extend to us is magnificent, and, therefore, when they come to this country we must take care that the hospitality we dispense is not such as to contrast unfavourably with that which they accord to us. I was anxious to come to some arrangement with the Treasury on the point, I and asked them to appoint an inter-Departmental Committee, to which they have agreed, so that I hope we shall never have again any controversy as to the cost of our Indian visitors. Therefore, though I have been greatly attacked in connection with the charges which are divided between India and the Imperial Exchequer, and although all these questions are legacies left to me by my predecessor in office, I am thankful to say that, should they arise again, they will be satisfactorily settled in a manner which the Indian taxpayer would appreciate.

I have only one more word to say, and that is with regard to the Coronation. I would point out that it had a deeper significance for India than for any other part of the British Empire. The relations between the Sovereign and the people of this country and the Colonies were the same at the recent Coronation as those which existed at previous Coronations. But it was otherwise with regard to India. It was the first Coronation at which the Sovereign of these islands was universally recognised from one end of India to the other as the Lord Paramount of India. At the last Coronation, in 1837, the Crown had little direct authority in Indian matters. The sway of the East India Company was confined to a territory which is only a comparatively small portion of the British Empire, outside which there were a number of wholly independent kingdoms which did not in any way acknowledge the sway of the East India Company. Now, as I have said, all this is changed, and the Sovereign of these islands is recognised as the Lord Paramount and undisputed Sovereign of a vast Indian Empire. I had no conception until I came into contact with the representatives of India how deep and intense is the sense of loyalty and reverence with which the Princes of India regard the person of the Sovereign. When His Majesty was so seriously ill, I had to receive a deputation of the native officers who had been specially selected to represent the native Army. They laid their swords at my feet, and appealed to me in the strongest and most touching terms, the sincerity of which could not be doubted, to have arrangements made by which they could stay in this country until they saw the person of their Sovereign and did him homage. They further stated that they were ready to remain without pay, provided they got rations, and that if they went back without having performed this duty their faces would be blackened in the eyes of their fellows. Therefore, we have in this feeling a bond of inestimable value, one which, in time of stress greater even than that we have lately passed through, will be more effective than the material reasons which we can advance on behalf of our rule in India; and it was to give full public expression to this feeling, by which all the antagonistic races and religions of India are united together in one common bond of fealty to the Throne, that we gave the reception on July 4th, at the India Office, and that the Great Durbar will be held on January 1st next in India. That Durbar, I hope, will be held under happy auspices. The restoration of the Sovereign to full health, the cessation of the drought, the full treasury, the indications of returning prosperity in different parts of India—all these will tend to make the occasion one of universal rejoicing. The Viceroy, who will preside, is worthy of the occasion. Lord Curzon, by his example, and his work of the last four and a half years all over the country, has infused fresh life and energy into every branch of Indian administration. He has raised the standard of official duty—high as it was before. He has been fearless in exposing wrong and in fighting down evil, and he has been equally energetic in advancing reform and improvement. The Durbar itself will be a scene almost unique in its historic picturesqueness. The civilisations of the East and the West will there meet and be blended together; and the most gorgeous trappings that can be suggested will surround our authority on that occasion. The fabric of our rule in India will be supported by a pomp and magnificence which will be worthy of the great organism which it represents. But fair and majestic as the edifice of our rule in India appears, we must never forget that, from the nature of its structure and the composition of its materials, there must be always in it risks and difficulties and possibly dangers and menaces from outside. I have spent the greater part of my official life in connection with the India Office, and it is many years ago since I went there in a subordinate capacity. The result of my experience is that I believe that henceforth the most serious of the difficulties that will cross the path of the Indian Government will not be those which are inherent, not those which are connected with the system of Government, but those which we have by our own action created. We have been too prone in the past to assume that any idea which dominates for the moment our own fiscal or industrial system, and which produces good results here, is a Heaven-born inspiration which, if transplanted anywhere, no matter under what conditions, would produce the same fruits as in these islands. The Government have had more than once to retrace their steps and, by legislation or otherwise, check or countercheck the consequences of measures which the light of after information had shown ought not to have been adopted. Therefore I would say to all who take an interest in India, whose numbers I believe are steadily increasing in this House, let us ever keep this experience before us, and remember that it is incumbent upon us to see that our administration in India is based upon progress, reforms, and improvement, and that it is necessary for us to be fully cognisant of the traditions, instincts and usages of those for whom these reforms and these improvements are intended. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

*(4.0.) SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I would like to take this opportunity of saying a few words on the general statement which the noble Lord has made, and in reference to some of the points which are not referred to in the Amendment on the Paper, upon which the noble Lord has expressed some opinion. Before I touch on the perhaps dry, and maybe controversial matters, I should like to associate myself with the noble Lord in the concluding portion of his address. I think we all congratulate him that he has extricated the India Office from what might have been unpopularity in connection with the details of the hospitality which this country rendered to the Indian guests at the Coronation. I would also take this opportunity of congratulating the noble Lord, if he will allow me to do so, on the admirable manner in which he discharged his own specific office during that season. In all the functions, great and small, he admirably represented this country, and he dealt with the great Indian potentates and princes who came over on that occasion in a manner which would increase the confidence they had in the home administration, and which in no way derogated from the hospitality or dignity of Great Britain.

The noble Lord's Budget speech has been, if he will allow me to say so, rather vague. He has skated very gently over some of the thin ice of the statement, and in generalities rather than in details he has very pleasantly taken the House away from the consideration of what are the most—I will not say serious, but, at all events, the questions which upon this Budget, as upon every Budget, we have chiefly to consider, viz., the finance of the year just closed and the finance of the year on which we are embarking. So far as the figures are concerned, that embarking took place some six months ago, and we know pretty well the accuracy of the prophecies made in the month of March. The House should, I think, appreciate what is really the smallness, comparatively speaking, of the real Indian Budget. We are accustomed to such very large figures in connection with these budgets that we get incorrect ideas both of Indian taxation, as it is called, and of Indian expenditure. On the second page of the noble Lord's Memorandum, the House will find that the figures are there stated in sterling money, with their net result — showing what we really raise by taxation and expend upon India. I find that the revenue of last year was £44,000,000, and the expenditure £39,000,000, leaving the large surplus to which the noble Lord has referred, and that the Budget with which the House is now asked to deal estimates for an income of £42,500,000, and an expenditure of £41,500,000, leaving a surplus of barely £1,000,000 sterling. I do not know whether the noble Lord alluded to the mode in which the surplus of the year 1901–02 has been dealt with.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON made an observation which was inaudible in the Press gallery.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I know it has gone into that Department, but I think we should notice in passing a very large sum allowed—and I think very wisely allowed—for the remission of arrears to tenants in India. I understand from the accounts as presented that considerably over £1,250,000 sterling has been written off the arrears of rents of those tenants who have suffered in consequence of the famine. Although, of course, the whole distribution is not a matter with which we need now consider, this was a very large contribution out of the surplus for that purpose, and large sums were also given for other purposes. The noble Lord has told us that the result of the figures that have come out in the course of the last six months is to make the surplus very much larger than he himself anticipated, for which the Indian Government budgetted. I want to call the attention of the House to that surplus, because I want to enlist the sympathies of hon. Members with respect to it. That surplus was put at something like £800,000, and the noble Lord has told us—although I am sure he has underestimated it—that he thinks it will be £1,750,000. Lord Curzon, when he came to deal with this income six months ago, was also, wisely and properly, very cautious, but he made one or two remarks to which I should like to call the attention of the House. He said—

> "When a Government finds itself in possession of large balances, the world is always more interested to know what they are going to do with them than how they got them, and I turn accordingly to the manner in which we have decided to dispose of our surplus funds."

Lord Curzon lays down three principles, which I am not going to challenge, although I am going to challenge his application of them. He said—

> "Every Government, every Viceroy, every Finance Minister, and, I am sure, every Chancellor of the Exchequer, must wish to reduce taxation, if they honestly and conscientiously can. We are not above those feelings, and, for my part, if the conditions of our finance continue to improve——"

—and the House will note that they have continued to improve by 100 per cent. in the six months—

> ——"if the conditions of our finance continue to improve, I entertain reasonable hopes of being able to recommend such a reduction before I leave this country. . . . But the questions we have to ask ourselves are these: Are the burdens imposed upon the community by existing taxation so heavy as to stand in urgent need of mitigation? Is our position sufficiently assured to enable us to make what must be a permanent sacrifice of revenue? After a period of exceptional distress, which has been confined to distinct parts of the country, is a reduction of taxation to be general rather than partial?"

The upshot of Lord Curzon's speech, and also of the speech of the Indian Finance Minister, was that there must be no reduction of taxation this year. When we get to the month of November in a financial year which expires on March 31st next, it is idle to talk of any reduction of taxation this year. But I think the House of Commons ought to have a word or two to say, especially as to its own position upon this question, with regard to the Budget of next year, the Budget which will be introduced next March, and this will be our only opportunity of raising the question on which I, for one, entertain a very strong opinion. I quite agree with Lord Curzons laying down of the general principles that we ought to follow, but there is another principle which he did not mention, a principle, I think, of both Indian and British finance, viz., that where the Government have the right—and they have the right—to increase taxation under exceptional circumstances, it is also their bounden duty and obligation to reduce the taxation so exceptionally raised when the occasion for which it was raised has passed away. We are not called upon to look forward to all the possibilities of what may come in future years; we have to deal with a year at a time, so to speak, and we have to ask ourselves whether we are under any obligation with reference to the reduction of a specific tax exceptionally increased when the occasion for which it was imposed has passed away. I am very glad to see that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has strolled in during this discussion. This is a matter not quite outside his ken, and I am sure he will appreciate the laying down of, and approve the doctrine that in this country when we have submitted to exceptional taxation for a specific purpose, when that purpose has passed away we expect the exceptional taxation to go also.

Now, I am going to apply that doctrine to the case before us. I need hardly name the tax to which I am about to refer. The noble Lord has forestalled some portion of my argument; he probably knew what it would be about.

I am going to say a word or two upon a tax which I consider to be the most oppressive tax levied in India—viz., the salt tax. I must tell the House the history of this tax. The salt tax was levied on a variety of scales, in a variety of manners, and under a variety of circumstances until the year 1882. In that year the tax was consolidated, the principle of its assessment made universal, and its rate fixed at two rupees per maund. (A maund is about 82 lbs. and two rupees is 2s. 8d.) In 1888 things had not been looking bright financially in India; there was not an equilibrum, and it was necessary to increase taxation. The Finance Minister of that day—I think it was Sir James Westland—increased the salt tax by half a rupee, viz., 8d. I must trouble the House with two or three quotations as to what the Finance Minister said in India, what the Secretary of State said in England, and what has been said again and again in this House upon that increase. Sir James Westland, speaking on behalf of the Government, said—

> "It is with the greatest reluctance that the Government finds itself obliged to have recourse to the salt tax"—

that is, to make up the deficit. I have told the House that the mode in which they proposed to deal with it was to increase the tax to two and a half rupees. Lord Cross, Secretary of State for India, in his despatch dated April 12th, 1888, said—

> "I do not propose to comment at length on any of the measures adopted by your Government except the general increase in the duty on salt. While I do not dispute the conclusion of your Government that such an increase was, under existing circumstances, unavoidable.
>
> "I am strongly of opinion that it should be looked upon as temporary, and that no effort should be spared to reduce the general duty as speedily as possible to the former rate."

Then the noble Lord goes on—

> "I will not dwell on the great regret with which I should at any time regard the imposition of additional burdens on the poorest classes of the population through the taxation of a necessary of life, but apart from all general consideration of what is, in such respects, right and equitable, there are, as your Excellency is well aware, in the case of the salt duty in India, weighty reasons for keeping it at as low a rate as possible. The policy enunciated by the Government in 1877 was to give to the people throughout India the means of obtaining an unlimited supply of salt at a very cheap rate, it being held that the interests of the people and of the public revenue were identical and that the proper system was to levy a low duty on an unrestricted consumption."

Lord Cross spoke in England again on that question, and on February 28th, 1889, said—

> "He was convinced that the earliest occasion should be taken to abrogate the increase on the salt tax."

In March of the same year Sir David Barbour, speaking in the Viceregal Council with special reference to a proposal for the abolition of the income tax, said—

> "I think it would be an injustice so gross as to amount to a scandal if the Government were to take off the income tax while retaining the salt duty at its present figure."

On this point the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, then Under Secretary for India, said on the 14th of August, 1890, speaking in the House of Commons on the Indian Budget—

> "The tax (on salt) was no doubt a tax which ought to be removed, and would be removed as soon as it should be financially possible to do so."

I need hardly say that during the time I had the honour of holding the office which the noble Lord now holds, we were becoming more and more hampered owing to the Exchange difficulty, and when the noble Lord took office, I know that difficulty had increased. In September, 1895, the noble Lord said—

> "I have looked through the proceeds of the various taxes which have been imposed, and I am bound to say that there is only one tax which does seem to press more heavily upon the Indian people, that is, the Salt Tax, which was raised in 1888. I shall watch the Salt Tax, which certainly seems to have reached the maximum limit, with a view, if possible, of taking an early opportunity of reducing it."

And if I may be egotistical enough to quote myself, I said in 1895—

> "I venture to predict that whoever is responsible for the finances of India, whenever the time comes when he may be in the happy position of possessing such a surplus as may enable him to propose a reduction in the burden of the people of India, the very first burden he will have to consider, with a view to its reduction, will be the Salt Tax, which is such a heavy burden on the people of India."

Under these circumstances I venture to say that this tax stands on a different footing from the ordinary taxes which may be raised or lowered, so to speak, according to the ideas prevalent in Calcutta at the time. Therefore this reduction has, so to speak, become an Imperial question and an Imperial obligation, in consequence of the pledges given to the people of India by the different representatives of the British Government, that as soon as possible this tax should be dealt with. It is a tax upon the prime necessary of life, the consumption of which has not been increased, although the population of India has increased largely. This tax produced ten years ago £5,500,000. The next year it produced £5,250,000, then £5,500,000, £5,600,000, £5,300,000, £5,400,000, £5,800,000, and now it is back again to £5,500,000; and the Budget of 1891–92 puts it at £5,393,000. That indicates that the consumption is not increasing, although the population is increasing. I do not wish to labour that point, but I do put it to the noble Lord that this is a question which he ought to decide himself, which he is pledged and which his predecessors are pledged. The noble Lord has a surplus which is already known to be £1,750,000, and no further delay ought to take place in making a large reduction of this tax. If the noble Lord would take off the amount put on in 1888 it would take about £1,100,000 of that surplus, and the House can calculate what a larger reduction suggested would do. What I am pleading for is that the increase put on in 1888 should be taken off now. The Finance Minister of India has stated very much the same as that which has been said by the noble Lord—that you ought not to take off a tax of this sort unless you can deal with a very considerable amount of reduction. I am in favour of making a much larger reduction because I think it is a tax which is most oppressive, and the amount it brings in altogether has practically reached its maximum and now is about £5,500,000.

There is another point to which I desire to draw the noble Lord's attention. He has spoken of the great progress made in our railway system, and he said that we have now turned the corner so far as railway finance is concerned. I noticed that the mileage of railways now opened is 25,529, and that there were from 2,000 to 3,000 miles of railway under construction. The number of passengers carried in 1898 was 152,000,000, while in 1901 it had increased to 195,000,000. In the same period the goods traffic has increased from 36,000,000 tons to 44,000,000. There was a very important speech delivered in the course of the debate in the Indian Council which propounded views which had been mentioned in this House and upon which I feel somewhat strongly, namely, as to the facilities given by the Government of India with reference to the construction of railways. I am going to quote from the speech of one of the wealthiest and most influential landlords in India, the Maharaja of Darbhanga. He is evidently a statesman of a very high order, and has a thorough grasp of the Indian situation. The difficulty to which he calls attention is the want of adequate means of internal communication by means of feeder lines. I had that trouble myself in 1895, and I fancy that the noble Lord has that trouble still. Feeder lines are not popular with the administration in India. This Maharaja spoke with knowledge, and I can endorse what he says. He says that if progress is desired in the construction of railways in India private enterprise should be encouraged, and he elaborates that argument with very great ability. He asks why cannot the principle of private enterprise be adopted in India, where he says the Rothschilds, the Barings, and the Morgans will not turn their attention to promote railway schemes like they do in other countries. He asks, with some show of justice, why should English capital be lavished so freely in other countries and not in India? I ask the noble Lord whether these difficulties which stop the progress of these railways are not due to the fact that they have to submit to red tape delays and difficulties. The noble Lord has alluded to the large sum which has been invested as part of the gold reserve. This was the settled principle of the Currency Committee which sat two or three years ago, for it decided that the profit upon rupees should not go into revenues of the Government of India. I may say that my colleagues and myself attached supreme importance to the principle that that money should never go into the revenues of India at all, but should form a separate gold reserve fund. I think the noble Lord has carried out those recommendations when we are told that £3,600,000 is now invested in Consols. There is another question which the noble Lord did not allude to, and that is the gross cost of the famine so far as he is able to ascertain—I mean the famine of the last three or four years. My own impression is that the famine has cost something between £14,000,000 and £16,000,000. We have had in years gone by long discussions as to the famine insurance fund, but it has been explained over and over again that there is no such thing as a famine insurance fund in the shape of a fund separately invested for the purpose. Now twenty-five years have elapsed since the system of that fund was put in operation, and during that period, with regard to the £1,000,000—that was the sum fixed as representing the famine insurance fund—we have been told again and again in this House that it was non-existent, and was never applied to famine purposes at all. I find that during the twenty-five years, for famine relief £12,750,000 has been spent, on protective works £9,250,000, on reduction of debt £9,500,000, and that the balance, at the end of the twenty-five years in favour of the fund is now £1,250,000. Having lived out its twenty-five years, I think the vindication of the policy of the fund is complete.

I congratulate the noble Lord and the Viceroy, and I congratulate the people of India on what is, after all, a prosperous Budget—a Budget which indicates by the increase of receipts, to which the noble Lord has alluded, an increase in the purchasing power of the people of India. These large imports have not been destroyed, they have not been burnt, they have not been re-exported. They have been consumed in India. Therefore, where there is a large increase of consumption, there must be increased power of purchasing following as a matter of course. These figures and all the various points of taxation to which the noble Lord has referred may be taken as a sound index from which the financier can draw conclusions as to the prosperity of the nation. So far as economic conditions are concerned the elements of prosperity are all present in the state of Indian finance at this time. I do not deny that poverty prevails among the Indian people. That is one of the reasons why I have spoken with reference to the salt duty. With all that, the country is not, I venture to think, on the down grade, but that it is improving financially and economically. I wish to refer to but one figure more, which the noble Lord did not give, but which I think the House ought to have before it, with reference to the burden of taxation in India. The burden of taxation in India for 1902–3 was 1s. 9¾d. per head without the increase of the land revenue—which is rent and not taxation. If the land revenue were added it would only bring it up to 3s. 3d. per head. These are circumstances of which, if we do not boast, we can say that we are discharging our duty every year better than the year before. There is no reason why we should slacken in our efforts. The noble Lord rather dissented to applying the principles popular here to India. I think that the principle of the reduction of the expenditure and the reduction of taxation are principles sound in every country in the world where they can be properly carried out. There is a danger in dealing with these large surpluses. It would be a danger to the English Exchequer. I do not think it is a good thing for the Exchequer of this country to have large surpluses. There was that state of things prevailing in this country thirty years ago, arising to a great extent from under-estimated revenue, and then there were the sensational results following when these surpluses were announced. I wish to say nothing controversial, but there was a period in this country prior to the breaking out of the recent war when it was not to the advantage of this country that we had these large surpluses, for I think the fact did induce excessive expenditure, which would not have been embarked upon if these surpluses had not existed. Chancellors of the Exchequer would not have faced the expenditure if they had had to put on taxation. We ought not to subject the people to additional burdens of taxation because we think we can spend the money better. I do hope that the noble Lord will take what I have said into his most serious consideration, and that he will lay down as a principle that pledges have been given to the people of India that taxation on salt should be reduced whenever the state of the funds will admit. Nobody can contravene the fact that there have been surpluses of millions during the past three years. Last year there was a surplus of nearly five millions, and this year, after making ample allowance for increased expenditure, there is an estimated surplus of something like two millions. I think under the circumstances it would be safe financial policy to budget next year upon the ascertained figures, not only of the past but of the reasonable prospects of the future, and to insist that the people of India should have what I am sure the people of England would have under similar circumstances —a reduction of their taxation.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I rise for the purpose of moving the Resolution that stands on the Paper in my name. I think the fact is to be regretted that we are discussing the Indian Budget at such a late date in the session. I am aware of the present difficulties of the position, and I realise the pressure of public business, but I hope that at no distant date there will be no such pressure, and that the affairs of India will not have to be thrust aside. It is a melancholy reflection, at all events at the present time, that India takes a greater interest in Parliament than Parliament takes in India. I do not believe that that is a permanent phase in the history of the attitude of Parliament to India. I wish also to associate myself in one sentence with the satisfaction expressed by the noble Lord opposite with reference to some of the signs of improvement which are now to be seen in the general situation of India. I am not a worshipper at the shrine of pessimism, and I for one do not believe that the Government of India will be unequal to the task of dealing with the serious problems which are in front of them. I think that improvement in future must lie along two channels—in the first place, the lightening of the burden of taxation upon the masses of the people, and, in the second place, the steady development of the resources of the country.

I now come to deal with the Motion which stands on the Paper. If I were to enter into the many recommendations of the Indian Expenditure Commission, it would obviously open a very wide field, but I will today confine myself strictly to one recommendation. Let me say first of all that I think it will be admitted on both sides of the House that the inquiry instituted by that Royal Commission was a very important one. We have already had some indication from the noble Lord opposite in the course of his speech, that the recommendations made by that Commission have borne important fruit. That inquiry not only emphasised the importance of giving reasonable arrangements as regards the financial relations between India and this country, but I think it did more. It emphasised the fact that there was conflict of opinion upon many points between the Treasury at home and the Government of India in India. The final decision of that Commission upon the point to which I draw attention particularly in my Resolution, was that a certain lump sum of £257,500 per annum should be transferred from the Indian Exchequer to the British Exchequer. I do not wish to make any comment on that point, but I would point out that no provision is made in that arrangement with regard to arrears, and I cannot regard as altogether satisfactory the reply of the noble Lord on that point to the question which was asked him last year. But I admit and recognise that for the present, at all events, the recommendation of that Commission settles the question.

The main point in my Motion is that the cost of the India Office in this country ought to be borne by the United Kingdom. That was the unanimous recommendation of the Commission. In dealing with this recommendation, or any other recommendation of the Commission, I, of course, refer to the recommendations made not by a section of the Commission, but by the Commission as a whole. There are one or two points I should like to mention in reference to the history of this recommendation. First of all, there is the fact that the recommendation was made. In paragraph 364 of the final Report of the Commission a specific grant of £50,000 is definitely recommended in aid of the charge for the India Office. Consequently it is interesting for the House to know the grounds upon which the Commission made the recommendation. They draw attention to the colonial analogy, and indicate as their view that no distinction should be drawn—or rather that the same principle ought to be regarded as bearing both on the case of the Colonial Office and that of the India Office. But they went on to explain that "we have never asked for the expenses of the Colonial Office here, and the Colonies throw so little work on the Colonial Office that their share would be infinitesimal." In the light of the events of the last three years there is certainly a grim irony in such a suggestion as that, and I do not suppose that the Colonial Secretary would accept it for a moment. I next come to the treatment accorded to this special recommendation by the India Office itself. The noble Lord in the course of his clear statement this afternoon informed the House that a lump sum was recommended for this purpose by the Commission. According to the recommendation of the Commission, a sum of £293,000 per annum was to be allocated as follows: India Office, £50,000; half of the military charges at Aden, £108,000; Persian mission £5,000; and half of the cost of transport £130,000. Another grant was finally decided upon. Some of the items were altered, but not to a very great extent. But there is one fact which I think is of great importance with reference to my Motion today. The item with regard to the charge for the India Office was omitted from the list altogether. I do not in any way wish to make it a point of attack that the sum finally agreed upon to be transferred from the one Exchequer to the other was less on paper than the Commission recommended, because the noble Lord has already explained that the difference of the two amounts is not because of any diminution in the amount the Government propose, but because of an arithmetical mistake in the calculation. As a matter of fact, I believe the Home Government decided to give £50,000 more than the sum originally recommended by the Royal Commission. The reason given by the Government for the changes made in the various items in the list was that it would put an end to certain payments now made in India, and that it would simplify accounts between the two Governments. I do not doubt that these results would follow the change made in the character of those items, but I venture to submit that that by itself is not a sufficient excuse for omitting out of the list this specially recommended item of £50,000 in aid of the charges of the India Office.

Is it not the case that upon these facts the Government have found themselves in a kind of dilemma? If the recommendation of the Royal Commission was founded upon good grounds, why not carry it out? If, on the other hand, it was based on insufficient grounds, why do not the Government deduct this sum of £50,000 from the total sum finally agreed to be given to India? I want to point out that the Royal Commission was so clear on the point, that they went into particulars as to how it was to be paid. I would quote one sentence from the Report of the Royal Commission:

> "This contribution may be made the subject either of a charge on the Consolidated Fund, or an annual vote in aid of the Home charges of the establishment of the Secretary of State for India. The choice of these two methods will be a question of policy."

I venture to express an opinion upon the facts. The Royal Commission, in making that recommendation, meant that this sum of £50,000 should be definitely paid by Parliament. They were naturally debarred from expressing an opinion as to the precise method by which it would be paid; but that it should be paid there was no doubt in their minds; and the object of my Motion today is that the spirit of that recommendation has not been carried out, and that it is time to suggest that it should be given effect to.

Before I conclude I wish to put before the House one or two of the main grounds on which I advocate the adoption of the Motion which stands in my name. Let me say, first of all, that I sweep away altogether, as irrelevant, personal considerations. This Motion is not aimed at any particular Government or any particular person in India. I have no doubt that the noble Lord opposite, who has never shown a disposition to shirk legitimate criticism, would not, on personal grounds, have the slightest objection to its adoption. What would be the gain which would result from the adoption of the suggestion I make in my Motion? First of all, we should have a further opportunity in every session of discussing Indian affairs. The fact that we have only one day in the year, is recognised as a serious evil, amounting almost to a constitutional scandal, when we consider the immense issues at stake, and the responsibility of Parliament in regard to these questions relating to India. I think I have heard the noble Lord opposite, on more than one occasion, state that, judging from outward signs, the interest of Parliament is on the wane in regard to Indian affairs. But what is the reason of that? The reason is that practically there is no opportunity for discussing Indian questions in this House. I do not blame particular Governments. The root of the difficulty is, of course, the congestion of public business, and until we remedy that, it is impossible to hope that we will find adequate time to deal with this problem. If it is said that the adoption of my Motion would only give one day more than we now enjoy for discussing Indian matters, I say that that would be exactly double the opportunity which we now enjoy for this purpose. There is another gain that would follow the adoption of my Motion; we should have an earlier day in the session for discussing Indian matters, and I think that would be a gain of considerable practical importance.

I would like to refer very briefly to the constitutional aspect of this question. How do we stand? First of all we have the fact that the Royal Commission unanimously reported in favour of the course suggested to be followed in my Motion. We have further the fact that the Government adopts the recommendation by including the sum in the amount of the Vote or grant which is now made year by year in aid of the Indian expenditure. I submit that it follows that, if the obligation is admitted in any form, this sum should be placed on the Estimates. But supposing that the noble Lord opposite takes the view that the recommendation of the Royal Commission cannot be regarded as finally settling the matter, I am prepared to argue the point on the general ground that, under present circumstances, the responsibility of the Secretary of State for India to Parliament should be directly acknowledged. The Secretary of State for India is the Minister through whom the authority of the Crown is exercised over India in England. But as Secretary of State for India he is capable of performing the functions of any other Secretary of State. He sits as a Cabinet Minister, and is precisely on the same footing as any other Minister of the Crown. I ask what practicable distinction can be drawn between the position of the noble Lord and that of the Colonial Secretary? It may be said in reply to this argument that in 1858, as has already been referred to by the noble Lord, we took over the powers, liabilities and duties of the East India Company, and that one of the conditions of that bargain was that all the expenses of administration, not only in India but in England, should be borne by India. But that does not conclusively apply to the present time. If the circumstances of India forty or fifty years ago rendered it necessary to make that bargain, it does not follow that these conditions should remain binding for ever. Hon. Members who have read the debates in *Hansard* which took place in 1858, must have been struck with the anxiety of Lord Stanley and of the House generally to make it clear that the responsibility of the Secretary for India for the Governnent of India should be directly acknowledged in Parliament. Another argument may be advanced against the line I am now taking. It may be said that the circumstances of India are different from those of other quarters of the Empire, that the conditions of our rule in India are exceptional, that the place of sentiment in the sphere of administration in India occupies a larger plane than elsewhere Let me admit all these different surroundings of the Indian position, but I ask what difference could the adoption of my Motion make in the present situation? Every year, as the House well knows, the action of the Secretary of State for India is debated on the Indian Budget, and from a practical standpoint the only difference made by adoption of my Motion would be that there would be two opportunities for this instead of one.

My last reason in favour of the Motion which I make is the ground of policy. I admit that the conditions of India are different from those of other portions of the Empire; but I lay the greatest importance upon not drawing the slightest distinction between the responsibility of Parliament to India in regard to Indian affairs and the responsibility of Parliament in regard to the administration of any other portion of His Majesty's dominions. If we were to argue on this point at any length it might very well be submitted that the fact that India is the only country under the British flag where our rule is debarred from criticism, is a reason why Parliament should be particularly jealous that no shadow of distinction should be drawn between the responsibility of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, and the responsibility of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary in respect to Colonial Affairs. There is another element which is of interest. India itself fills a very different place in the Empire from what it did forty or forty-five years ago. When we took over the government of India in 1858 we were mainly concerned with internal administration, but to day the case is wholly different. India touches the Empire at a hundred points. There are few questions in our foreign affairs which arise to-day which have not either a direct or an indirect bearing on India; and that is a consideration which is of weight in the relation to my Motion.

I conclude with this final remark. I have spoken of the past in regard to India; I have spoken of the present on Indian matters. But what of the future? What is the inevitable trend of events to day in regard to foreign affairs? Does not everything point to the fact that the great Empire of the future will be the nation dominating the East? I regard India as the greatest factor on our side in this development, and the object of every debate on India should be to impress the people of this country with the immense importance of India to the Empire. The essential condition of obtaining that end is to arouse to action the conscience of Parliament in regard to its responsibility in every branch of Indian administration. I do not look on this Motion as a panacea for every unsatisfactory characteristic of our rule in India, but I do look upon it as a step in the right direction, because I believe it will contribute towards bringing about a new interest in this matter. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

*(5.3.) SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): If there is anything too optimistic in the remarks o the Secretary of State for India, the answer is to be found in the words of one who was long employed in the India Office under the right hon. Gentleman and his predecessors, who said, "We do not sufficiently distinguish between the prosperity of India and the felicity of its inhabitants." We are too much inclined to look at the material prosperity of India as a whole, rather than at the poverty which is to be found in many parts of that country. I think, in confirmation of that view, the Secretary of State went out of his way to admit that, owing to the mistakes in our system of the settlement of land values, the people of India had been thrown increasingly into the hands of the money lenders. As the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton, in his powerful denunciation of the salt tax, showed the House, in years of what are called prosperity by the Secretary of State, we have been unable as yet to diminish, still more to abolish, a tax which has all along been, admittedly by this House, probably one of the worst ever levied in the civilised world; a tax distinctly admitted by the Government of India for the last thirty years to be one which subtracted from the health of India in the most marked way. The slackness of the consumption of salt through the heaviness of the tax tends directly to the ill health of the people in a way not known to the people of other countries. The right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton spoke of the salt tax as having been reduced. It was reduced at the time of which he spoke, but I remember the views entertained at the time of that reduction by my friend Professor Fawcett I remember it was pointed out and demonstrated most conclusively that however greatly it was reduced in one province it was increased at the same moment in every other part of that Empire; and that tax, which was again increased in 1888, has not yet been repealed or even diminished to its former level. In view of these facts, the quotation I gave just now is the true explanation. Both Russia and India are examples at the present time of countries rapidly increasing in the scale of nations, but where, nevertheless, the increase of the prosperity of the country is consistent with a low and diminishing standard of happiness of a large part of the population.

Now, the Secretary of State for India is in fact directly responsible to the House for the condition of India. The Secretary of State is the real autocrat of India—the Secretary of State who is controlled, and in the last resort dismissed, by this House. The right hon. Gentleman speaks of the part that is played in India by the name and person of the King. The Emperor plays a greater part and looms larger in the eyes of the people of India in their daily life, than does the King in the United Kingdom or the King Emperor in the Colonies. But the King is advised by the Secretary of State, and it is the Secretary of State who is the real responsible ruler of India. India is a statutory Empire with legislative restrictions—restrictions which are imposed by an Act of this Parliament, a Parliament in which India is not represented and never will be. Those legislative restrictions are such that we can repeal them any day, and we, therefore, through our influence over the Secretary of State, are the persons directly responsible for the condition of India today. I cannot but think, looking at the present position of the Empire, that this responsibility to India ought to be the first responsibility in our mind. India makes greater sacrifices for the Empire than any other part of it except the United Kingdom. India has so enormous a population that when you talk of the population of the British Empire it is the population of India you speak of—the rest hardly counts. Looking at the position of India, it seems to me that the heaviest of all the responsibilities that press upon this House and the Government is the responsibility we have towards India. We ought constantly to hold that responsibility in mind, because there is no constituency behind us to make us bear it in mind. We owe it to ourselves and our consciences alone, and we should keep this responsibility in view, and if we fail in that trust there is no one to remind us of it. There are some who salve their consciences with the belief that some day it will be otherwise, and that some machinery will be set up, under which India will be able to influence the opinion, not of this House, but of some Imperial Council which will take the place of this House. Sir, I believe those are dreams, and will never be anything more than dreams. I believe that what exists now will continue to exist, and that we shall be responsible to the United Kingdom for the chief control of India. Parliamentary representation for India is, to my mind, impossible; because it is impossible without unfairness to grant her Parliamentary representation. India, moreover, is not a single dependency; not a country progressing towards a Parliamentary system as a nation. It is an Empire within an Empire; a country of diverse races which are only brought together by our rule, and which must be ruled from hence and by us. The Government's responsibility is, I think, higher towards India than towards the Colonies, and far more direct. India is far more directly under our control than the Colonies. Take the question of tariffs alone. Not only are all the self-governing Colonies absolutely independent of us with regard to tariffs, but the so-called Crown Colonies are almost independent, and nearly all have a representative system under which they fix their own tariffs. The Colonies are not affected by what we do here. India is. And looking at the overwhelming sacrifices which she makes for the Empire, and the direct manner in which she is governed by our proceedings and our acts, the Cabinet responsibility towards her is far greater than that towards any other part of the Empire which we rule. I pointed out, when first the Government came into office, that the first thing they did was to reduce the contribution towards the defence of the Empire by the Straits Settlement, and the fact brought back to our minds was that these contributions were a mere trifle compared with those which we asked from the Indian Empire. India, too, is quite different from the Colonies. If discussions were to take place, as they did take place, with regard to ourselves and India and the Colonies, I venture to think we are more able to understand India than the Colonies. That is not the view in the Colonies, but in India we have to deal with a civilisation very much more ancient than our own, and, that being so, we having a middle civilisation, are more able to understand India than the newer civilisation of the Colonies. Now, we had a Conference with the Colonies, in which was discussed a system of representation and a system of tariffs for the whole Empire. In that

Conference India seems to have been entirely forgotten. Not a word was said about India. Once only is the name of India mentioned in the Blue-book. A table was given to the Conference to be published in the Blue-book, "Appendix 1, British Empire Military and Naval Expenditure," containing a list of the various component parts of the Empire, and India is omitted from that list. It seems hardly credible that it should be so, but there is the fact. When we turn to our table prepared by the Admiralty—and I congratulate my hon. friend at the Admiralty—India does figure in it. The naval expenditure of India is one-fiftieth of the military expenditure, and yet that one-fiftieth is infinitely larger than the sum our Colonies are expected to give in the future. The largest of all the questions considered by the Conference was the future Parliament, the future governing body of the Empire; but in that future governing body there seems to be no place for India. We are told what is the opinion of the Government and of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which is that the Colonies are to have representation when they wish it; if not in this Parliament, they are to have representation in an Imperial Council which is to supersede Parliament as regards the affairs of the Empire. Yet in the whole of the discussion of that contingency India is not named. I blame the Government for entering upon the consideration of this gigantic problem without bearing in mind the position of India in the Empire. I second the Resolution of my hon. friend, because it brings home these facts to us, and because I think it is only by a Vote in this House for the Secretary of State that this responsibility could be brought home.

Now, besides the proof I have attempted to give by the quotations of these references from the proceedings in the Blue-book of the Colonial Conference, I would refer for a moment to the military aspect of the question. The Cabinet came to a decision on the 27th or 28th of February last with regard to the pay of the British Army; it was communicated to the Viceroy of India on one of those dates, and on the 4th of March it was communicated to this House as a settled thing. Yet we now know from the Viceroy's own words that at the first moment that he heard of it he protested against it as affecting India. I take it that he protested against it in Council, because a Council was called immediately, and the Viceroy's words are, "We protested." Yet those protests were never presented to the House. I believe in discussing the Indian Budget in the old days, we should have insisted on having those protests laid before us. With regard to the rate of pay and the terms of service, those two matters have always been, and I believe are indissolubly, connected. When in years past we have made proposals here which would have an effect both on the rate of pay and the terms of service, we have always been met by the statement that the changes proposed by us would make some small increase in the burdens of India. We have always contended that they would be reduced, but the highest cost that could have been forced on India in that way is far less than the initial cost to be paid by India under the present scheme. It is difficult to discuss this matter without the Papers, for the absence of which the right hon. Gentleman has apologised, but upon it I support the argument of my hon. friend. Every Member of this House will be willing to admit that there is some ground for modifications and improvements in the present system, and every Member will admit that we owe a duty to India, and that that duty can be best performed here. Now, in this change we propose to make there may be a danger arising from the Parliamentary interference in Indian affairs; but even a certain risk of the danger of undue Parliamentary interference, which, if it appears, will be checked by the good sense of those concerned in the Government of India, such interference, if it occurred, would be better than mere dull apathy and neglect. I believe the hands of the Secretary of State, and those who have a keen sense of responsibility with regard to India, would be strengthened and not weakened when they felt they had the support of the people of this country at their back. If there is a danger such as I speak of, there is a means of checking that danger by the India Office using and organising more than they now do Indian native opinion on all subjects. Native opinion is generally opposed to the view forced upon the Secretary of State; and I believe the India Office might do more than it does in organising native opinion in the local municipalities, not only of towns but of the rural local governments, and also the opinions of chiefs and princes. I am not entering into any comments on the Government of India, but I think, after the repeal of the salt tax—if it were abolished—the Government should spend money on improvements in police. I admit that there must be increase of expenditure in the army, and that you must increase the number of white officers in the Indian regiments, and also that there must be an increase of expenditure on the transport. What I press for today is a greater recognition of our responsibility for the affairs of India; a responsibility which I believe to be recognised to the full by the Secretary of State. When you consider the position of India in the Empire, even in trade—if you exclude Australia, you find her trade with us is infinitely greater than that of all the other self-governing Colonies, and on a scale which puts India immediately after the United States, France, and Germany—I maintain that we do not give enough time and thought to India, and that we have not hitherto recognised in anything like an adequate degree the responsibility this House of Commons and the nation owes to India.

Amendment proposed—

"'To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the cost of the Parliamentary representatives of the India Office, with an adequate staff, should be paid by the United Kingdom by a Vote of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*(5.30.) MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): One cannot but feel sympathy with a great deal that has been said by the two speakers to whom we have just listened. I think that what the noble Lord representing the Government of India has said, and also what the Viceroy put before us in his great speech on March 26th, in discussing the Indian Budget, shows what a large part India plays in the affairs of this great British Empire; and it is because I feel that India is so much an Imperial concern that I would not indeed follow precisely the hon. Member for Denbigh, or the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, but I would suggest that a considerable sum, perhaps not less than the £50,000 recommended by the Royal Commission, should be charged on the Consolidated Fund annually. I am aware that a sum of £50,000 has, as a matter of fact, been arranged for the benefit of India in a different way. It has gone really to defray the expenses of Aden. But when we look at Aden, and consider the relations of India on the one hand, and the United Kingdom on the other, with points like China and Persia, it seems to me that the idea that India should ever have to pay half the expenses of Aden while the United Kingdom paid the other half, is preposterous. I think that we might very fairly make a present to India—treating it as a part of the recommendations of the Royal Commission—of that sum of £50,000 in respect of Aden, and follow the recommendation of the Royal Commission in placing £50,000 to the credit of India in respect of the establishment of the India Office. According to the Home charges as detailed in my noble friend's Explanatory Memorandum, the charges of the India Office amount to over £180,000 a year, or three times as much as the Colonial Office charges. How they reach that large total it is difficult to say. I would take this opportunity of asking my noble friend to explain this apparent omission—that although Section 53 of the Government of India Act of 1858 prescribes that the salaries and allowances in connection with the establishment of his office, as head of the Council of India, should be anually laid before this House at the same time as other facts and figures in reference to India, they do not appear to be so laid. I notice that in the excerpt from the statute of 1858, which is printed at the beginning of the "Condition and Progress of India," certain lines from the statute are omitted. Whether they include anything else I am not quite sure, but they do include the stipulation of the Act of 1858, which requires that the salaries and allowances should be yearly laid before Parliament with any changes made. In order, if possible, to avoid raising a matter of detail, I looked into the India Office list to see if the figures were given there, but I failed to find them.

May I say a word on one or two points in relation to the finances of India and as to the causes of prosperity which have not yet been adverted to? Apart from the imports represented by Customs duties, it appears from the statement of the Financial Member of Council that there are large imports of machinery and mill work, approximating in value for the year under review to £476,000, which do not become subject to the tariffs, and there is also a large increase—amounting to 34 per cent. of the production—in Indian-made cotton. This is indicated by the Cotton Excise Returns. We have these two further evidences of the greatly increased purchasing and consuming power of the native population.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member will not be in order on this Amendment in discussing amendments of the Indian tariff.

*Mr. MOON: I presume I may follow preceding speakers in making a slight reference to the salt duty?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. Member that the right hon. Baronet who seconded the Amendment was speaking to the main question. The question put from the Chair since then limits the discussion.

*Mr. MOON: The other remarks I desired to offer not being applicable, I will merely ask my noble friend to solve my difficulty as to the omission of certain facts and figures required by the statute of the Government of India.

*Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As you, Sir, have pointed out that any further discussion before this Motion is disposed of must be strictly limited to the words of the Motion, it would perhaps be convenient that I should say a few words in reply to the speeches which have been made, so that the House may then speak at length on other subjects. The argument advanced in support of the proposition is two-fold, financial and constitutional. The financial argument I think I can answer in a very few words. The Royal Commission recommended that a certain charge should be transferred from the Indian Exchequer to the Imperial Exchequer, and in that sum they included £50,000, which they thought might be given in support of the India Office. His Majesty's Government transferred the full charge suggested from the Indian Exchequer to the British Treasury, but they did not follow into all the detailed proposals of the Royal Commission. Although they gave the exact amount, they did not include that particular £50,000; they included another £50,000. Therefore the financial suggestion of the Commission was thoroughly complied with. If this proposal were carried, it would mean putting a charge upon the British revenue which is not suggested by the Commission. I do not quite know what the amount would be; the Motion of the hon. Gentleman is very vague; it might be £240,000, it might be £50,000. Anyhow, I propose to call it £50,000. The constitutional advantage which is to accrue is an extra day's discussion, but I think the hon. Gentleman will find he is putting the value of a day's discussion somewhat high if he asks the taxpayers of this country to pay £50,000 for it.

Mr. CAINE: £35,000.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As to the desire which Parliament has to have more opportunities of discussing, not small details, but questions of principle, with regard to the administration of India, I must frankly say that, owing to the manner in which time is now distributed, I think the debates and deliberations of this House have gone back from the condition which existed when I first took office as Under Secretary of State for India. It will rather surprise the House to know that when I was Under Secretary of State for India I had more Motions to deal with and more debates to take part in than the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The reason was that, under the system which then prevailed, you had a number of abstract Motions twice a week—on Tuesday and Friday—and the Members who spoke, as a rule, spoke with special knowledge of the subject under discussion. I have always regretted that that class of Motion was put on one side.

But why was it put on one side? Because at that time, as soon as you got to Supply, Supply was always voted, whereas now some twenty-six days or more are taken for elaborate discussion of Supply. I think that is the time which is the most wasted of any in the House. It is the discussion in which the House takes the least interest, in which the public take the least interest, and which gives the most unsatisfactory results. Of course I feel the force of a great deal the right hon. Baronet has said. He called me an autocrat, but he must remember that I am surrounded by a Council——

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: You have large powers which the Council do not share.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: But the Council are absolute on matters of finance, and whoever is absolute on matters of finance occupies a very prominent position.

MR. CAINE: But you select members of your Council.

* LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I protest against that remark. They are a body of men who are absolutely independent; they are men selected for ten years; they have nothing to hope for; can anybody believe that because the Secretary of State appoints a member to be in the Council, that member subordinates his opinion to that of the person who appoints him?

But it must be recognised that at the time India was transferred to the Crown, India differed from any other part of the Empire—and does differ. You cannot establish any analogy between India and the Colonies. It is a separate and distinct organism; it is an empire, the like of which the world has never seen. There are conditions surrounding it which make it almost impossible at times to fit in constitutionally the personal representations of other parts of the Empire. Therefore, when this Colonial Conference was held it was quite clear to the Council that the great mass of the discussion would be really outside India; but the Secretary of State for the Colonies at once assented to my proposal that there should be present a well-known and distinguished Indian civilian, representing the India Office, to watch the proceedings, and who was to report to the India Office, or take any action he thought fit if a discussion was of such a nature as in any way to affect directly the interests of India. Now, would the House, if they wished to take greater part in the discussion of Indian Affairs, gain by this particular proposal? At present there is no legal obligation to have a discussion on the Budget at all. The form of words merely affirms that the accounts of the year closed are so and so, and so and so, and it is designed merely to give the House the opportunity of having a general discussion on finance. At present the Secretary of State for India is always in a difficulty upon any Indian question which may arise, because Indian questions are considered to be really outside Party controversies and Party organisations, and the result is that, unless the action of the Secretary of State is in any way challenged, he is very likely to be hard pressed unless he has a good case. But the moment you put the Secretary of State's salary on the Estimates all that is changed. Any discussion on a Vote affecting a member of the Government is more or less a vote of censure, and the House knows quite well from long experience that a vote of that kind is hardly ever carried. Therefore I think we should go back as regards the tone of our debates if this proposal were agreed to. If it be the desire of the House to devote more time to the discussion of Indian affairs and less to the minute examination of the Estimates, why should not the House come to some arrangement on that basis? Surely what we have to do is not to add to the number of days given to Supply, but to knock off some of the questions which are already over-discussed. I do not know that I need follow the right hon. Baronet in all his remarks regarding the contributions of India to the Army. With regard to the facts that the right hon. Baronet has addcued, I would only make just one general observation. There is a great distinction between the British Army located in

India and the British Army located in other parts of the Empire. As soon as the troops reach India they are under the control of the Indian Government and cannot be moved away without the assent of the Indian Government. India pays for the troops because she has absolute control of them. In the same way India contributes a certain sum to the Navy, but it is to pay for ships, not for the ordinary service of the Navy, but for special service, notably for the suppression of pirates in the Persian Gulf. These contributions are not for Imperial purposes, but for purposes which are essentially and peculiarly Indian. I cannot hold out any hope of the Government's accepting this Motion, but I would suggest that if there is an earnest desire to discuss questions of principle affecting the administration of India, some arrangement might be made by which nights now given to the Estimates could be given to Indian affairs. That seems to me a very much better way of attaining the object which the mover and seconder of this Motion have put forward, and certainly it would be much more reasonable than to say that another Vote should be added to the Estimates for the purpose of providing for one extra afternoon's discussion.

(5.48.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 119; Noes, 45. (Division List No. 494.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, AlexanderH.(Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, RtHn.J.A(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. HnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
GordonMajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
HamiltonRtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Kemp, George
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. WilliamEdw.H
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, SirCharlesM.(Durham
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W.(Stalybridge
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs).
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bowles, T. Gibson(Kings'Lynn)
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cremer, William Randal
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Labouchere, Henry
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Mr. Schwann.

Main Question again proposed.

*(6.0.) MR. CAINE: I think I can congratulate the House on the increased interest which is now evidenced in Indian questions. During the many years I have been connected with the House, I have taken an active part in the discussion of the Indian Budget, and I have been accustomed to speak to two or three individuals. There is another evidence of the popular interest which is taken in Indian affairs in the recognition given to them by having two Parliamentary representatives of India in this House. Before I come to the main subject I have chosen for discussion tonight, I should like, in the first place, to express the gratification with which I heard the noble Lord refer to the speech I delivered last February, and in connection with which I see that one of the main representations of that speech has been given effect to by the Indian Government in the Central Provinces. My speech has escaped the fate of other speeches which are made on this side of the House; according to the noble Lord they are cast into the waste-paper basket, even by their authors.

I want for a moment or two to criticise the supposed surpluses which, the noble Lord claims, have existed in the Budgets of the last three years. The surplus this year was £837,700. I congratulate the noble Lord on that fact. The surplus last year was £4,672,000, and the total surpluses of the last three years were over eight millions, but it is significant to note that, during those years, although there has been these large surpluses, not a single reduction has been made in the taxation borne by the Indian people. The surpluses have all been swallowed up by additional expenditure. I do not like to speak strongly on the figures which have been laid before us, but the surpluses the noble Lord speaks of are entirely fallacious. During the last fifteen years the total increase of public burdens has risen to something like fifteen millions without a single remission of any taxation, with the exception of the recent remission of £2,000,000 of arrears of land revenue, which, after all, is only writing off a bad debt. The increase in the Army expenditure has been terrible during the last few years. It is not possible to conceive of an Indian Budget surplus, however fat, that is not promptly swallowed up by Army and other fresh and increasing expenditure. In 1887, the Army expenditure in India was £20,874,000; in 1892 it had risen to nearly £24,000,000; and in 1895 to £25,500,000. Taking the six years from 1887 to 1892 the total Army expenditure was £130,000,000, while in the last six years, 1897 to 1902, it reached the astounding figure of £153,000,000—an average increase of £4,000,000 per annum for Army expenditure alone during the comparative period submitted. The surpluses were largely made up of contributions from this country in consequence of the hiring of Indian troops for South Africa and China for services altogether outside the boundaries of the Indian Empire. In 1902, £1,006,000 was paid in this way; in 1901, £3,850,000; and in 1900, £3,909,000. During the last three years the British Exchequer has paid close upon £10,000,000 for the hire of Indian troops. If this amount had been borne on the Indian Estimates, instead of these three years showing total surpluses of £7,000,000 there would have been a deficit of £3,000,000 involving fresh taxation, or the absorption into revenue of the profits which the noble Lord referred to in his able speech

There is no reason why the relief enjoyed during the last three years should not become permanent. The South African war has made it abundantly clear that the home Government looks upon the Indian army as largely a reserve force for the needs of the Empire at large, and India ought to be permanently relieved of at least £3,000,000 a year by a grant from the British Exchequer, in acknowledgment of the clear fact that 30,000 troops in the Indian Army are not required for the defence of India, but are simply reserves for the Imperial forces. The taxation of the country has got no relief whatever, and is maintained at an unjustifiably high level, while expenditure increases and the people are growing steadily poorer in spite of the optimistic opinions expressed today by the noble Lord in his speech. I recommend Members of this House to read and study the remarkable speech of Professor Gokhale, the member for the Bombay Presidency in the Viceroy's Council, at page 164 of this year's Financial Statement. It will help hon. Members to realise the profound wisdom of some words in the concluding paragraph of Sir Edward Law's Financial Statement, when he said—

> "I strongly deprecate exaggerated optimism. The vicissitudes of fortune in a country mainly dependent on agriculture must be borne in mind, and we must not count too certainly on the continuance of the prosperity now enjoyed by the people of India. We must not allow our satisfaction over generally good results to deaden our sympathy for suffering groups and classes."

I turn from general criticism of the Budget speech to the subject I wish specially to refer to, and I am afraid I shall have to trouble the House at some length on that question. I have placed on the Paper a Motion which I do not now intend to move. It reads as follows: "That this House views with alarm the steady annual increase in the consumption of alcoholic liquors and intoxicating drugs throughout India, and is of opinion that the Excise system of India is calculated to stimulate intemperance and crime, to increase the poverty of the people, and to diminish revenue from every other source." I hold that Excise revenue of any kind which is drawn from drink and drunkenness and the demoralisation of the people is practically burning the candle at both ends. What revenue you get is wasted in the national expenses brought about in consequence of the demoralisation of the people themselves. I well recollect Mr. Gladstone, in one of his brilliant Budget speeches, congratulated the House and the country on the largely diminished revenue from the sale of intoxicating liquors. I met him in the Lobby afterwards, and I asked him what he would do if he had to deal with a nation of total abstainers. "Oh!" he said "do you think I am such a poor Chancellor of the Exchequer as not to be able to frame a satisfactory Budget for a nation of total abstainers?" The right hon. Gentleman knew that such a nation would be more taxable material.

Sir, I make no apology if I have to occupy the House at some length on this subject. It is of the greatest possible importance to the people of India. India steadily year by year increases her consumption of intoxicants. The noble Lord slid very quickly over his reference to that. I wish to give the House the figures, and to show that the increase of revenue is from Excise as well as from other sources. I wish to remind the House that India is practically a nation of total abstainers by religion, habits of life, climate, and especially by reason of their poverty. The people of India are against the use of liquor, and any restrictions which the Government of India might make with regard to the traffic, would meet with the cordial approval of the whole of the people. I say that if the Government were to pass a local option law giving to seven-eighths of the adult population of the districts power to decide, the liquor shops of India from end to end would be closed within twelve months. The Indian people are not a drinking people. There are not more than thirty million people who use intoxicating liquors at all. Every element of Indian society is favourable to a great restriction in the traffic in intoxicating liquor and drugs, but instead of recognising these favourable conditions, and suppressing intemperance, the Government have built up an Excise system, which obtains a vast revenue from a stimulated sale of intoxicating liquor. Twenty years ago, in 1880, the total Excise revenue for the year was 2,838,000Rx.; in 1890 it was 4,891,000Rx.; and in 1900, 5,775,000Rx. In the last three decades the totals were: 1870 to 1880, 24,000,000Rx.; 1880 to 1890, 39,000,000Rx.; and 1890 to 1900, 54,000,000Rx. These figures represent the revenue drawn from the sale of intoxicating liquor and drugs, the increase during the last ten years from a traffic which is an absolute Government monopoly being 39 per cent. with an increase of only 4½ per cent. in the population. If you take the twenty years there is an increase of 125 per cent., with an increase of 17½ per cent. in the population. The noble Lord in his speech referred to the falling off of opium. I am glad, and I believe the House is glad, that there should be a diminution in opium, but all I can say is that, however much sobriety may be increasing in China, the Government of India is making it up by pushing the sale of intoxicating liquor, opium included, among the Indian people. The question naturally arises—and I have no doubt it will be raised by the noble Lord who will reply—how much of this increase comes from consumption and how much from enhanced duty. I have been trying for the last fifteen years to get some data on which a sound reply could be given to this question, but they obstinately refuse to give anything of the kind. I declare that, at the very least, 70 per cent. of this increase in revenue is due to an increase in consumption. I tested it very simply a year or two ago. I have all the Excise reports of India for the last fifteen years. I take the North West Provinces and Oudh, and there I find the reported gallonage of spirits turned out from the Government stills in 1897 was 661,000; in 1898, 885,000; and in 1899, 1,169,000, showing an increase of 80 per cent. in three years. The Government of India publishes an annual romance which it jocularly entitles "A Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India." The following passage occurs in its last issue—

> "There has been a considerable increase in the net Excise revenue during the past thirty years (from £1,755,000 in 1875 to £4,239,000 in 1901—140 per cent.) but this increase, though in part due to enhanced consumption caused by the growth of the population and the general increase of earnings, is yet largely, and in some localities mainly, the result of improved Excise administration, which has doubled or trebled the rates of taxation, and has at the same time restricted the use of illicit intoxicants."

This is a complete summary of the defence of the Government for its scandalous Excise system, and will probably form the defence which will be offered presently. I must remind the House that the Excise revenue in India is not raised as it is in this country, by a duty per gallon on spirits. The Government is its own distiller, and sells the licence to deal by public auction to the highest bidder—every liquor shop being, therefore, practically a tied-house to the Government distillery. The Excise revenue consists of first, and mainly, auctioned monopolies for the sale of liquors and intoxicating drugs over defined areas; second, still-head duty on all spirits manufactured by the farmers within the walls of a Government distillery; third, licences for the working of stills by the liquor farmer himself, known as the out-still system. This stupendous and steady increase of revenue is due almost entirely to the fierce competition for licences, stimulated and encouraged by the revenue collectors of the Government, regardless of the moral and material ruin of the poor Indian ryots, or factory-hands, whose wretched incomes are depleted to get money to pay for Durbars and the salaries of British Cabinet Ministers.

I will presently justify these broad charges by an analysis of a single State administration, that of Assam. But I wish to say a word or two about the nature of the intoxicants which a Christian Government deals out to its defenceless Hindu and Mohammedan subjects, whose religions absolutely forbid their use. They are threefold. First, alcohol; second, opium; third, Indian hemp. The alcohol is mainly produced by distillation from the sugary flowers of the mhowa tree, and to a lesser extent from sugar refuse, called jaggery. The latter is an inferior rum. The mhowa, or country spirit as it is called, is damnable stuff. One of the conditions of the licence is that it shall not be sold to a British soldier, though six bottles at a time may be sold to an Indian woman. In the Report of the Commission appointed by the Government of Bengal to inquire into the excise of country spirits in Bengal in 1883–4 the following remarks occur by Dr. Warden—

> "The worst sample of Indian liquor contained nearly seven times as much fusel oil

per fluid ounce as Dr. Dupre's sample of unrectified Scotch whiskey, while the least contaminated contains rather less than half the amount found in fine 'samsho.' This method of indicating the relative purity of the spirits is correct as long as we compare the volumes of the various liquors. But low-class consumers of liquor take it for the effects which it produces. An ounce of 'chirkunda' at nine pies per bottle does not equal an ounce, say, of Scotch whiskey or 'samsho' in alcoholic strength. To institute, therefore, a comparison between Indian country liquor and the spirits examined by Dr. Dupre, the ratio which the fusel oil bears to the ethylic alcohol must be the standard; and by this standard the least contaminated of the Indian country liquors contained twice the amount of fusel oil present in 'Cape smoke.'"

Well, the Government have the best of reasons for forbidding the sale to soldiers. Why then sell it to the weakly and ill-nourished Indian peasant? As to opium and Indian hemp, the Government retail these drugs, not as medicines, but for the purposes of intoxication only. I have been in a Lucknow opium den, now happily abolished, and I recollect seeing and counting 126 men and women dead drunk on opium. This was in a house licensed by the Government, controlled by the Government, and the profits of which went largely to the Government The Government even sells the opium specially prepared for smoking, and the poor people can take it home and smoke it there instead of in the opium dens. Hemp, like opium, can only be obtained in this country by prescription, and signed for in the druggist's poison book. The sale of hasheesh (which is the same article under another name) is prohibited in Egypt, and the manufacture and sale of it is prohibited in Afghanistan.

I will illustrate the operation of the Indian excise system by its administration in a single province, that of Assam. The conditions there are not worse than in any other province of India, but rather better than the average. The average increase in the consumption over all India during the last twenty years has been 125 per cent., with an increase in population of 17 per cent. In Assam the increase in the same period has been only 73 per cent. in consumption, with 25 per. cent. increase in the population. I shall rest my case upon two documents first, the last Annual Excise Report for Assam: and, second, a most remarkable Memorandum impeaching the excise system of Assam, which has just been published by Mr. James Buckingham, C.I.E., the chairman of the Assam branch of the Indian Tea Association. Mr. Buckingham is a business man of great ability and reputation, and has been a member of the Viceroy's Council. For a long time past the tea planters of Assam and Darjeeling have been making indignant protests against the policy which has long been pursued by the Indian Government of opening liquor and opium shops close up to the boundaries of tea plantations. These tea gardens are mostly manned by labourers drawn from a distance, the Assamese not caring for the work. They are drawn mainly from Bengal, but also come in considerable numbers from other parts of India. There is absolutely nothing in the habits of life of a tea-garden coolie to give the smallest excuse for the provision by the State of facilities for getting drunk on filthy and badly-distilled spirits, and for stupefying themselves with opium and hemp drugs. But the Indian Government appears to be blind to all moral considerations in the excise administration, and thinks only of exploiting these unhappy coolies for revenue purposes. The planter worm has at last turned, and through their recognised leader, Mr. Buckingham, they have issued a Memorandum on this grievance of the tea planter that is the most concise, conclusive, and damning indictment of the Government's excise policy that the heart of the temperance reformer can desire.

The Assam tea planters are neither teetotalers nor prohibitionists. They are simply traders who find that the liquor shops, thrust upon them against their will to the demoralisation of their coolies, inflict terrible financial loss upon themselves, as well as all manner of evil things upon their labourers, towards whom they naturally and rightly feel a strong sense of responsibility. They have, therefore, no prejudice against the use of intoxicating liquors as such; and yet we find them united as one man in the strong and insistent demand for a root and branch reform of the licensing system and its administration, while the great bulk of them declare that nothing but absolute prohibition will meet their just grievance. From 1897 to 1898 the population of the coolie labourers on the tea gardens of the Lakhimpur district increased from 81,957, to 84,974, about 4 per cent., but in the same period the consumption of spirits increased 53 per cent. Over the whole of Assam the revenue for spirits alone had increased during the last ten years no less than 250 per cent., while the tea-garden adult population rose only 70 per cent.

Mr. Buckingham, in preparing this document, has been fully aware that mere denunciation of the iniquity of the grog shops will not solve the difficulties of the problem. He has, therefore, proceeded to collect statistics from competent authorities connected with the tea-garden industry, which completely expose the weakness of the out-still system in Assam, while at the same time basing upon that evidence proposals for more efficient control, with a view to abating, if not destroying, the terrible social and moral mischief resulting from it. Mr. Buckingham recites a number of Clauses from the Report of the Excise Commission of 1889, which was the outcome of action taken in Parliament by the hon. Member for Flintshire and myself. These quoted Clauses are those relating to Assam, and show conclusively how ineffective their recommendations were, and how completely they have failed from their professed object, because they have been persistently ignored by the Excise Department of Assam. The main recommendation of that Commission was that the tea planters themselves should apply for licences and run liquor shops of their own for the "benefit" of their coolies. It is twelve years since this preposterous recommendation was given, and yet the Government, in the face of the universal refusal of tea planters to become potboys, can still find no other remedy but this to propose, as is shown in the answer given by the Secretary of State for India to myself in Parliament last April, who said that he was of opinion that the plan of getting the tea planters to take on the liquor shops already existing in the vicinity of their gardens had his entire approval, and was likely to conduce to good order and sobriety!

Now, Mr. Buckingham publishes analyses of samples of the spirits sold in the Government grog shops to these unhappy tea coolies. Messrs. Waldie & Co are distinguished analytical chemists with a large practice, and no one can doubt the accuracy of their work. They publicly declare that the spirits distilled and sold by the Government of India contain seven times as much fusel oil as unrectified Scotch whiskey, rendering their use as a beverage very deleterious, and that it is unfit for human consumption owing to the amount of fusel oil and other deleterious matters present. The last Excise Report for Assam says:

> "The Commissioner reports that no deleterious substance was found in the samples analysed by the Chemical Examiner for analysis, and that the quality of the liquor was pronounced good."

The Report goes on to give the Examiner away ruthlessly in the next paragraph, which says:

> "Analyses in the past have been directed to the discovery of adulterants, and have not been used to ascertain whether the liquor does not contain a perniciously high proportion of fusel oil."

What an extraordinary confession! Who on earth is this precious "Chemical Examiner" employed by the Indian Government to analyse their intoxicants, and who never tests them for the commonest and most deleterious poison to be found in distilled intoxicants? The reports of the medical officers, and managers on the tea gardens, cited by Mr. Buckingham, reveal a horrible and appalling condition of things. It is impossible to read them without seeing the most conclusive evidence of the nature of the stuff sold in the results which its consumption produces. The medical officers declare that it is a most fruitful cause of cholera and dysentery, and make it clear that frequent epidemics of these fell Indian scourges have been directly caused by these Government grog shops. Innumerable and definite cases are quoted in which deaths have ensued among the coolies by direct alcoholic poisoning, as well as by cholera, apoplexy, dysentery, pneumonia, enteric fever, murder, and manslaughter, the result of drink. The reports of the managers bristle with riots, wife-beating, desertion of work, brawls, accidental deaths, and fifty other intolerable evils wrought upon these wretched coolies, with grave financial losses to their employers.

The first question addressed by Mr. Buckingham to the principal medical officers in the tea district of Assam was as follows—

> "What is your opinion regarding native grog shops in the vicinity of tea gardens? Do you consider they are prejudicial to the health of the coolies? Do you think they should be wholly abolished or partially?"

There is not a single reply sent in which does not make it quite clear that every medical officer, most of them holding distinguished English degrees, is satisfied of the prejudicial character of the grog shops, and the reply to that part of the question is emphatically "Yes." Taking the entire number of fourteen medical officers, their replies to the latter Clause of the question are also very emphatic. Nine of them urge total prohibition, while five recommend severe control. Some of these five, however, urge practical prohibition so far as the vicinity of the tea gardens are concerned. It is clear that, without exception, the medical officers declare the present system to be utterly mischievous, while two-thirds of them are convinced that total prohibition of the grog shops is urgently needed. The managers thoroughly endorse the opinions of the medical officers. I make no personal reflection on the Excise authorities in Assam, or upon the very distinguished Chief Commissioner who has sanctioned it, when I say that the Report of their administration for the year 1901–1902 is scandalous. They are called upon to administer a system which is rotten to the very core, provided for them by the Central Government of India, and the angel Gabriel himself could not present a better report with such a system at his back. There is no province in India where the protests against the Excise administration are so loud, so bitter, or so fully justified. The Indian Excise administration is bad enough all over the Empire, but Assam has more Europeans engaged personally in agriculture than any other province, owing to the great development of the tea industry, and they are not, like the more timid Indian farmer elsewhere, afraid to speak out. There is no complaint more bitter, all through the pages of Mr. Buckingham's memorandum, echoed by every witness cited by him, than that of defective administration. He contends that supervision is a farce, that the liquor sellers break the law continually and with complete impunity, and that the constant protests of the tea planters, and their demand for tighter control meet with no response from the Excise Department. A careful examination of the Report shows that this complaint is fully justified. The total expenditure of the Excise Department for the entire province of Assam was £770. The total Excise revenue was £192,000. The area of the province of Assam is 49,000 square miles, the population 5½ millions. The Government thus get 250 rupees of revenue for every one spent on administration. This accounts for the deep affection with which the Government treat Excise revenue. It brings in a larger return for less expenditure than any other source of revenue in their budget. The expenses of collecting opium revenue are 61 per cent.; forest, 59 per cent.; land, 16½ per cent.; salt, 6 per cent.; Customs, 5 per cent.; Excise, 4 per cent. We fear they know only too well that the tight and vigorous administration which is so justly clamoured for by the tea planters would enormously reduce the revenue. In face of the terrible facts brought out by Mr. Buckingham, it is quite impossible for them ever again to protest against the charge so often brought against them, that they deliberately stimulate the sale of intoxicants for the money it brings in, and that moral considerations are flung to the wind when they clash with revenue interests. If the present system is to be maintained in Assam, an expenditure of at least £50,000 a year, instead of £770, will be necessary if the farmers they employ to distribute these filthy and poisonous liquors are to be kept in anything like decent control.

There is another fact brought out in the Report which fully justifies this grave accusation. It is the custom everywhere throughout India for the Government to sanction a far greater number of licences than can be taken up, and then to push them upon the liquor farmers to the utmost of the sanction. This year the Assam Commissioner sanctioned for settlement 1,426 shops; only 1,276 shops of all descriptions have been taken up! Now what possible explanation can be given of this simple fact? Why should the Excise Commissioner sanction 150 more liquor and opium dens than even the stimulated demand is able and willing to take up? The Commissioner is much grieved that people drink so little. Here is his lament—

> "The results, as compared with 1901-2, are disappointing. In the Surma valley the bidders combined, and the sales had to be held several times. In Cachar the bids obtained were so low that orders were issued to keep a considerable number of shops closed. Several of these have since been settled on reasonable terms. In Sylhet the ring of liquor farmers is stronger than ever, and owing to scarcity in the early part of the year under review, and consequent low profits, outsiders were even less willing than usual to compete for shops. . . . The decrease in Lakhimpur is under all heads, and is attributed to combinations among vendors. . . . In Kamrup the decrease is general, and is attributed to the absence of competition. . . . In almost every district the sales were conducted by the deputy Commissioner in person. It is noteworthy that this was not done in the district where the sales were worst."

What does this quotation tell us? The Excise Department have screwed up the farmers to such a point that "sales had to be held several times." In Cachar, when the bidding was low, and shops were not taken up, steps were taken to push this dirty trade, and eventually "several of these got settled on reasonable terms." In Sylhet the trade is so overdone, so many liquor shops have been thrust on the community, that no outsider would compete, and the liquor combine had it all their own way. Things seem to have got so low down in Assam, so many unnecessary shops have been opened, that the sales, to be any success at all, had to be "conducted by the Deputy Commissioner in person." I must not weary the House with extracts from Mr. Buckingham's memorandum, which show, with only too terrible truth, the methods which the liquor and opium farmers are compelled to take up to sell their demoralising compounds, and pay the rents screwed out of them by the Government. If they were properly controlled and inspected, if they were compelled to keep their premises in decent sanitary order, if they were fitly punished for their constant breaches of the law, for the riots and disorder which they produce, the revenue would fall to less than one half its present amount, and that would neverdo. Revenue! revenue! revenue! even when drawn from the very life blood of the people and their inevitable moral ruin, is the fetish of the Indian Government in its Excise administration. That hoary old excuse for the steady increase of revenue from drink and those intoxicating drugs which are in the poison list of every British pharmaceutical chemist, that it is to prevent illicit sale, is of course trotted out in the Excise Report. But how hollow it all is! It has been proved over and over again that any smuggling and illicit distillation is almost entirely on the part of the liquor farmers, who cheat the Excise right and left, with perfect impunity. How can there be any preventive system in a province as big as the whole of England out of a total expenditure of £770? In the whole of the vast province of Assam only fifty-one prosecutions for the illicit sale or manufacture of liquor are reported for the year under review, and there were only nineteen cases in all of opium and drug smuggling and illicit cultivation. There has been a so-called "preventive staff" appointed, but in nine months operations only two cases were detected by them. It is a singular comment on the "prevention of illicit sale" theory of which the Government are so fond. that the Excise Commissioner, commenting on some other matter says—

> "This is not as it should be, and tends to establish the theory that much of the value of a licence to sell opium lies in the facilities it affords for trafficking in the contraband article."

Here is a frank confession of what is notorious in all well-informed native circles in India, that the Government Returns of liquor and drugs sold are hopelessly fallacious, and do not, in all probability, account for more than half the stuff sold, the other half having never paid duty. It might reasonably be expected that the existence during 1901-02 of the horrible details of debauchery and demoralisation revealed in Mr. Buckingham's able memorandum would have brought out a great list of prosecutions under the Excise and opium laws. The total convictions under these laws for the entire province of Assam were 301. The nature of the offences might be erroneously inferred from Mr. Buckingham's memorandum, but they are all for offences tending to diminish revenue. There is no mention of any licence being taken away, and the lightness of the punishments may be inferred from the fact that the total amount of fines only realised some £400. I ask the House to weigh this extraordinary statement made on the first page of the Excise Report, "Local public opinion was consulted as far as possible before any new shops were licensed." This formula always appears year by year in the Excise Report of every province of India. It is most discreditable to the Government that this silly lie should ever be allowed to appear at all. If next year they would back it up with some instances of the so-called consultation of public opinion, I will undertake to furnish, for every such case, half a dozen in which public opinion has been outraged. There is not a liquor or drug shop in the whole tea districts of Assam and Darjeeling that is not a glaring outrage on local public opinion, as Mr. Buckingham most clearly demonstrates.

If there is one thing more surely established by Mr. Buckingham's witnesses it is the deleterious and poisonous quality of the abominable stuff sold by the Government's liquor farmers. Yet we read: "The Commissioner reports that no deleterious substance was found in the samples of country spirit sent to the chemical examiner for analysis, and the quality of the liquor was pronounced good." In face of this statement, what are we to say of the analyses reported by Mr. Buckingham, in every case of which fusel oil is found in large quantity? But the simplest test to which the "good quality" of this country spirit can be brought is the regulation which prevails all over India, that no country liquor seller shall ever sell drink to a British soldier. Will the Government repeal this regulation? I am sure they will not; but all the same they will go on selling their vile compounds to the poor Assam tea coolie. Last week in reply to a Question from the hon. and gallant Member for Taunton about the importation of spirits into West Africa, containing fusel oil, the Secretary of State for the Colonies stated "that the Governor of Lagos is of opinion that alcohol containing a noxious substance like fusel oil in deleterious quantity should be seized and dealt with in such a way that it should not reach the public, and that legislation would be passed by the Council of his Government securing this." The Secretary of State for War protects the British soldier from the fusel oil of the Indian Government, the Secretary of State for the Colonies protects the West African negro, the Secretary of State for India sells it to Indian peasants in 100,000 grog shops

There are about 300 shops in Assam licensed for the sale of "ganja." These were so far in excess of the demand that twenty-four licences were surrendered during the year. One might reasonably have expected that these would have been allowed to lapse. That is not the method of the Government of India! The Report says: "Sixteen of these licences were resettled, but at greatly reduced prices." What an abominable bit of administration here reveals itself. These licences, "at greatly reduced prices," are, of course, put into competition with others who had paid the full licence tax, and the Government holds up its hands in pious horror because the liquor and opium farmers form a trade combination against dishonest treatment. Now, what is this "ganja," of which the Report remarks, with touching frankness, "the decrease in consumption is not satisfactory?" It is a preparation of Indian hemp, and is the most noxious and maddening intoxicant of all the varieties dealt in by the Indian Government. It cannot be procured at any chemist's shop in this country without a medical prescription and the customer's signature in the poison book. In Egypt it became such a curse to the people, under the name of "hasheesh," that the Government prohibited its sale and manufacture, employed a fleet of gunboats to stop its importation, and sent anyone who was found with it in his possession to gaol with hard labour for three months. The British Government places ganja on the lists of poisons, and prohibits its sale except on medical prescriptions. The Egyptian Government has penal laws for those possessing it, the Amir of Afghanistan prohibits its manufacture and sale. The Christian Government of India draws its revenue from the open sale of this virulent and maddening poison to the poor Indian peasant, and public opinion in this country is silent and acquiesces. On this damnable Excise system, so terribly exposed by Mr. Buckingham, the Government build up a steadily increasing revenue. In Assam, during the last ten years, the revenue from country spirit alone has almost trebled. It was 273,000 rupees in 1890, and 703,000 in 1901. Is it to treble itself during the next ten years? Why not, if the same system is to prevail? The Government are simply turning the coolie population of the tea districts into confirmed drunkards, drawing revenue out of the vice and degradation of these unhappy people. On April 14th last I asked the Secretary of State for India a long Question on this tea planters' grievance. He gave the usual stereotyped answer†, and I asked this additional question—

> "Is there any necessity whatever for forcing these liquor shops on the planters who do not want them?"

To which the Secretary of State replied—

> "My information is that they are wanted."

At that time Mr. Buckingham's Memorandum had not appeared. If the planters "want" these liquor shops, they certainly make their "wants" known in strange fashion. It will also be seen that, in reply to a further Question in July, the Secretary of State said that Mr. Buckingham's Memorandum was receiving the "serious consideration" of the Government. We know by sad experience what this means. Two years delay, and nothing at the end of it! I have in my hand a document which is the outcome of this "serious consideration." It is addressed by the Chief Commissioner of Assam to the Deputy Commissioners of Labour Districts, Assam. I wish time permitted me to submit this foolish and futile document to the House in full, but I will conclude my speech with just a few extracts from it. I understand the Secretary of State is going to lay it presently on the Table of the House, when the replies have come in. When it is published, the House will see that it is no honest inquiry at all, but that the Commissioners of Labour are practically told what reply is expected by the following paragraphs:—

> "I am directed to forward, with the following remarks, a copy of a Memorandum on the Excise Administration of Assam which was written by Mr. J. Buckingham, C.I.E.
>
> "Within the last twenty years the Excise arrangements of Assam have been four times subjected to examination. It cannot, then, be stated that the question has not received a good deal of consideration; but having regard to its importance, Mr. Fuller is quite willing to re-open it.
>
> "There are two conclusions, however, which he holds to have been finally established by the investigations that have already been made. The first is that the imported coolie population of the province is mainly recruited from classes who are in the habit of drinking fermented or distilled liquor, and that, in affording them opportunities of obtaining liquor in Assam, the Government is merely supplying an existing want, not creating a new one. The second conclusion is that if coolies are denied excise liquor, they will brew rice beer, and that there can be a great deal of drunkenness and demoralisation on tea estates which are quite unaffected by licensed liquor shops. There is a passage in Mr. Buckingham's Memorandum which may be taken to imply that the tea-garden coolie is naturally an abstemious man. This is a view which, in Mr. Fuller's opinion, is quite untenable. Moreover, certain of the views which are referred to in the Memorandum are coloured by the idea that coolies can be, or should be, altogether prevented from drinking. This is a reform which is both hopeless and unjustifiable. The Officiating Chief Commissioner can see no reason why we should expect a higher standard of restraint amongst the coolies on a tea garden than amongst the labouring classes in Europe."

Any practical person reading these paragraphs in the light of Mr. Buckingham's Memorandum, and Mr. Buckingham's Memorandum in the light of these paragraphs, will see that any honest inquiry is damned at the outset. I cannot continue my speech further, having already trespassed sorely on the time of the House. I can only say, that if this state of things in Assam is not dealt with by the Government on the lines of Mr. Buckingham's Memorandum, I shall next session use the forms of the House to the utmost of my power to get some protection for these poor Indian peasants, and the tea planters who employ them, by debate and division of the Members of this House, who are the only final Court of Appeal on Indian grievances.

*(6.50.) THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down at the opening of his speech referred to the speech of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State, and characterised it as that of a confirmed optimist. I am not sure that the speech of the hon. Member does not lay him still more open to the charge of being a confirmed pessimist. I do not think I ever heard a speech in this House which exhibited a greater capacity for swallowing wholesale the accusations made against the conduct of the Indian

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cvi., 142.

Administration, or which made less allowance for the difficulties of the Government, and showed less patience in waiting for the result of the inquiries which the Government is undertaking. I do not think that we have any right to complain that the hon. Member should raise this subject. It is an extremely important subject, and the hon. Member is well known as an advocate of temperance reform, and no one is better qualified to bring such a subject to our notice. At the same time, I think his attack is a little premature. The protest by Mr. Buckingham, to which he has drawn attention, and which he says is the most damning indictment that anyone could desire, has only just been received, and there has been very little time for the local authorities to institute the searching inquiry that has been promised, much less to express their conclusions upon it. But I might point out that the charges which the hon. Gentleman has made tonight are not new. They have all been made before, even before 1889, and I believe in the last twenty years the Excise administration in India as a whole, and in Assam in particular, has been inquired into no less than four or five times.

Mr. CAINE: To no result.

*Earl PERCY: The last time it was inquired into, it had formed the subject of a Resolution in this House, and as a result of that Resolution in 1889 the whole system was examined by the Government, and the result of that inquiry was embodied in a despatch of the Government of India, and endorsed in a despatch by Lord Cross in the following year.

Mr. CAINE: Which were never carried out.

*Earl PERCY: I am coming to that in a moment. The conclusions arrived at by the Government of India as regards Assam were that the excise system then and now in force—the outstill system — was the only possible one, although not theoretically the best, and that the principles by which the Excise Commissioners were to be guided in fixing the number of shops and the price of the licences were in the first place the local demand, so far as it could be reasonably ascertained, and in the second place the paramount necessity of keeping the price of liquor as high as was compatible with the discouragement of illicit manufacture and smuggling. The Government of India repudiated as strongly as it repudiates today the desire to stimulate the consumption in Assam, or any part of India, for the sake of increasing the revenues; but, on the other hand, they expressed in the strongest language their opinion, and I think that opinion is one which must be expressed by every Government that has to deal with this question in India, that it would not be either just or possible to use the machinery of Excise for one particular province in India in order to deny the population of that province the legitimate facilities for indulgence which are enjoyed by the population of every other. The hon. Member is, of course, an avowed prohibitionist, and he is quite logical, for he would enforce that view in England as he would in India; but I think he will himself admit that if we are going to force this system on the people of India there is some argument for first forcing it upon ourselves at home. The hon. Member spoke with truth of the Indian people as extremely abstemious, but it is by no means true that drinking is prohibited by the religion of the majority of the population, nor is it true that there is a considerable degree of drinking among them. I do not know a single administrator of any experience who has dealt with this question who has not expressed himself quite as strongly as the Government of India in 1889, to the effect that it would be quite impossible, even supposing they had a system of local option and could get a three-fifths majority of the people in favour of closing the liquor shops—there is not an Indian administrator who believes you would have power to enforce that law on the minority. I think the fact that although these charges were made ten years ago, and although the circumstances under which they were made have not changed, the Government of India have expressed their readiness to undertake another inquiry, ought to be sufficient disproof of any insinuation of indifference on their part to the interests either of the coolie or of the planter. On the other hand, the very fact that these charges have been reiterated after such a short interval ought, I think, to make us very careful how we accept them without careful inquiry, especially without taking into consideration the peculiar circumstances under which they are now made.

It may be within the recollection of some hon. Members of this House that only a very short time ago the Government of India passed a new Act dealing with the question of the labour supply in Assam. That has always been a very difficult question, because the proportion of the labour element in the Province of Assam itself is only three per cent. of the total population, and therefore most of the labour which is employed on the plantations has to be imported from outside. The Act in question was the subject of very heated controversy in the native Press, and between what I may call the party of the planters on the one hand, and the philanthropic party, which has been so ably represented by Sir H. Cotton, on the other. Broadly speaking, that Act represented a compromise which went some way towards meeting the views of both parties. It enforced an addition to the statutory minimum monthly wage of the coolie, but by no means an addition equivalent to the increase which had been demanded by Sir H. Cotton. On the other hand, it met the views of the planters who complained of the competition which they suffered from unlicensed contractors by placing the unlicensed contractors under very severe restrictions, and encouraging the system of recruiting by garden sardars. Since that Act was passed the tea industry has undoubtedly been going through a period of very serious depression. That depression is possibly owing to some extent to over-production; it is largely, I daresay, due to the high taxation which it has been necessary to maintain in consequence of the prolongation of the South African war; but it is mainly due to the lack of an adequate labour supply. That supply has been, I believe not more, but a little less than before the Act was passed. I frankly admit that all these considerations are considerations which entitle the tea industry to our commiseration, and any representations which the planters may make will deserve our most serious and sympathetic consideration. On the other hand, the very fact that this agitation synchronises with a period of depression is, I think, evidence of what I believe to be the fact—that the agitation is motived quite as much by economic considerations as by considerations of philanthropy.

MR. CAINE: And quite properly.

*EARL PERCY: I am not bringing that as a charge against the promoters, but the *fons et origo* of this agitation is really the lack of an adequate labour supply. Sir H. Cotton's party, on the one hand, say that the planters will never get a sufficient labour force unless they considerably increase the present statutory wage, which Sir H. Cotton calls a miserable pittance as compared with the wage offered in the mining districts adjacent to the districts in which the coolies live. The planters, on the other hand, say that no increase of the statutory wage on their part will have any effect so long as the coolies are encouraged or allowed to spend a large portion of their earnings in the liquor shops which are under the control of the Government. It is obvious, therefore, that exactly in so far as the charge against the Excise administration in Assam can be made out, so far is the case for an increase of the statutory wage diminished. I do not say that that militates in the least against the case for inquiry, but it does make it extremely important that we should be careful how we accept the accusations that are made.

Let me ask the House to consider what is the case and the scope for inquiry. To my mind it seems that the scope for inquiry must necessarily be a very limited one. If it is true, as the Government of India said ten years ago, that total prohibition is impossible, and that the central distillery system is impossible under the conditions in Assam, all we have to consider are the reforms which have been proposed in the working of the out-still system. We have to ask ourselves whether it is really a fact, as the hon. Gentleman opposite says, that the consumption of liquor has increased to a greater extent than would be warranted by the increase in the population, by the increase of wealth—and what he really leaves out of consideration—by the stricter administration of the law; and also, supposing that statement be true, whether it is an evil which it is in the power of the Government to remedy, or whether it is an inseparable accompaniment of the only system of which the conditions of Assam permit. I will not weary the House by going into a discussion of the rival merits of what is called the central distillery system and the out-still system. We have always admitted, and we admit now, that the adoption of the out-still system in Assam was not due to any preference for it in the abstract, but merely to geographical and climatic conditions and to habits, and customs of the population which no arguments on the part of temperance or other advocates in this House can alter. In Assam you have a district, roughly speaking, of 400 miles long by fifty broad, four-fifths of which is over-grown by high tree or grass jungle. It possesses exceedingly scanty means of communication, and the population, which is so sparse that I think it is reckoned to be something like 100 to the square mile, lives not in villages, but in scattered houses, surrounded by jungle, and therefore with every facility for carrying on illicit manufacture either in their own homes or in the adjacent jungle. In addition, you have to consider the habits of this population. The hon. Gentleman opposite said—I think with reference to the Assam population—that they were not, on the whole, consumers of liquor. That, I believe, is perfectly true. The great mass of the native population of Assam are not addicted to the consumption of liquor to the same extent, perhaps, as the natives of India and elsewhere.

Mr. CAINE: They are the chief customers of the opium and ganja shops.

*Earl PERCY: The drug that they do use is not spirits, but ganja, which is exceedingly deleterious; at any rate, it is a stronger compound than the ordinary liquor. I recollect that in his report for the year 1889 the Excise Commissioner expressed the opinion that it would be a positive advantage if the population which now consume opium and ganja could be weaned from the habit and persuaded to drink the country spirit instead. The bulk of the native population of Assam consume, I believe, twice as much opium as the population of any other province in India. Besides them, you have a number of aboriginal or hill tribes, both in the north and in the south, and in no part, I believe, is the territory of these hill tribes divided from the tea plantations by a distance of more than twenty miles. These tribes have always been inveterate liquor drinkers in the past, and not merely drinkers of the ordinary beer which I believe the hon. Member thinks is harmless—for they are in the habit of subjecting fermented liquor to a further process of distillation, under which process it becomes a spirit of very considerable strength. In addition to the hill tribes and the ordinary population, you have half a million coolies imported every year from outside, from Bengal and the Lower Sonthals, who have all been accustomed to the ordinary facilities for obtaining liquor which obtain in every other part of India, and who, if the party represented by Sir H. Cotton are to be believed, are, owing to the low class of wages offered, drawn from the lower strata of the population. What would be the practical result of adopting a change, and introducing there the central distillery system under which a still-head duty is levied upon every gallon of spirits distilled in the distillery? In the first place, there is one very grave objection to the central distillery system, viz., that where it is adopted, the very fact that you ensure a fixed price per gallon of liquor is an obvious temptation to the distiller himself either to distil liquor outside the central distillery or to smuggle outside free of duty the liquor he distils inside. For that reason the system requires a very large preventive force.

Mr. CAINE: I hope the noble Lord does not think I advocate the central distillery system.

*Earl PERCY: The hon. Member, I may point out, has made no practical proposals beyond reading out a series of very small suggestions which were not made by Mr. Buckingham himself, but were tabulated by him as a list of recommendations which had from time to time been made by various advocates of reform. If the hon. Gentleman does not wish me to pursue the topic of the central distillery system, I will only say that he is at one with us in thinking that all we can do is to consider the reforms which can be suggested for removing the evils attaching to the present system. That system has a great many disadvantages, but it, at any rate, has the great advantage that it does enlist the interest of the liquor sellers on the side of the law, and they have exceptional means of ascertaining where the manufacture and smuggling of liquor is going on.

What are the reforms suggested for removing the evils attaching to this system? Broadly speaking, I think they fall under three heads—(1) the reduction of the number of liquor shops, (2) more effective and adequate supervision, and (3) more careful analysis of the liquor supplied. As regards the last two points, there is no difference at all as to policy between the Government and the hon. Member. The only difference is a question of fact and of practice—whether the reforms which the hon. Member suggests can be carried out or not. Take the question of analysis. We are all anxious that the system of analysis should be as strict as possible, and strict enough to detect the presence, if such there be, of deleterious ingredients. So far as the Excise Reports go, they do not indicate that the tests which have been applied have revealed the presence of any of these noxious ingredients, but the Excise Commissioner draws attention to the fact that it is quite true that these analyses in the past have not been directed to discovering the proportions of fusel oil in the liquor supplied. Fusel oil is present in considerable quantities in all liquors distilled at a high temperature, and the Commission is at the present moment considering how far a better quantitative test can be adopted. The authority quoted by the hon. Member opposite does not give details with regard to the presence of fusel oil. He states that there are large quantities, but he does not give the figures. I may just mention in passing that if the hon. Member will look at the Excise Report of the administration of Assam for 1899–1900 he will see that the strength of the ordinary country liquor is exceedingly low, there is only one case over proof, and the vast majority are 57, 52, 46 and 72 under proof.

MR. CAINE: The noble Lord will find that the dilution is very largely done with water drawn from a source which is full of all sorts of germs of disease.

* EARL PERCY: I know that one of the reforms suggested is that a purer water supply should be insisted upon. I am told, however, that the mere process of distillation is supposed to get rid of most impurities. I will pass on now to the question of supervision. Here, again, the question between us is one of practicability and not one of policy. The chief difficulty, as I have already explained, is the enormous size of the area which has to be supervised, the very small staff which is available, and, what is more important, the limited area from which that staff can be drawn owing to the unattractiveness of the Assam climate to the natives of other parts of India. In 1889 it was pointed out that it was practically impossible in such a vast area, with a police force of only about one to every forty square miles, to suppress all illegalities, and the Deputy Commissioner said he did not believe any preventive force would achieve complete success under such circumstances. The hon. Gentleman alluded to the amount of the Excise revenue compared with the cost of the Excise staff, but those figures are not a reliable test, because neither the pay of the police nor of the land revenue officials, both of whom have Excise duties, come under the head of Excise expenditure. Allow me to say in conclusion on this point that I believe that the Chief Commissioner is at the present moment considering the possibility of appointing special officers to assist the Deputy Commissioners in this work.

I pass on now to the question of the reduction of the number of shops. That is a controversy with which we are all familiar at home. It is probable that there is some relation between the number of shops and the amount of drunkenness in a district. I do not want to discuss the general question, but it is obvious that in a district like Assam—which is exceedingly sparsely populated, and where the facilities for illicit traffic are so great — the amount of local demand and the number of shops required must be far more accurately gauged by people on the spot than it can be gauged here. The gist of the charge against us is that we are pushing the sale and the consumption of liquor by a system of repeated auctions. The fact that the auctions have to be held over and over again in order to secure that the proper number of licences is taken up does not prove in any sense that the number of shops is in excess of local requirements. In the first place the hon. Member ignores the fact that the auction system is one of the few means we have of testing whether there is a local demand or not; and, in the second place, the objection is theoretical rather than practical, because under the present system a man is only allowed to buy one shop, and the Government see that he does not sell liquor at any place not mentioned in his contract, and the retail price of the liquor is strictly laid down. Therefore it is practically impossible for the licencee to diminish the cost of his liquor below the amount represented by the licence tax "*plus*" the cost of production. On these occasions when auctions had to be held over and over again there has been a combination amongst the licencees to force down the price of licences and to obtain at a profit to themselves—at the cost of the revenue and, therefore, at the cost of the taxpayer—the right to sell liquor below the ordinary prices to the consumer. That is an object which we are bound to prohibit, both in the interest of the coolies themselves and in the cause of temperance. It is true that you cannot raise the price of liquor beyond a certain point without inducing illicit manufacture on a large scale, but I think the hon. Gentleman opposite would be the first to admit that the high price of liquor has, at all event, something to do with discouraging consumption and intemperance. The hon. Member has given a lot of figures, and I confess I was unable to jot them down as he went along. It was almost impossible with the large number of figures which the hon. Member gave to check them straight off.

MR. CAINE: I sent them to the noble Lord three days ago.

*EARL PERCY: I beg the hon. Member's pardon, but I did not know that they were the same figures. I have a few figures here that I should like to ask his attention to. Take, for instance, the actual growth of the Excise revenue during the past ten years in India as a whole. Taking India as a whole, the Excise revenue increased from £3,300,000 in 1890-91 to £3,937,000 in 1900-01. This shows an increase of only £600,000 in ten years, and this notwithstanding the fact that there has been an increase of 10,000,000 in the population, and that during that period there has been a stricter system under which illicit traffic has been largely prevented, that the duties on every kind of liquor and drugs, both country and foreign, have been considerably raised, and that the central distillery system has been widely extended. I come now to the Excise figures for Assam, and here the figures are in rupees. The increase in Assam is about 600,000 Rs., but of the total revenue of 2,933,390 Rs. only £720,870 is supplied by liquor, the rest being supplied by drugs. It is true that the liquor revenue in Assam has more than doubled, and that the population has only increased by 12 per cent., and the hon. Gentleman attributes that apparently to the increase in the facilities for drinking. What is the fact? The number of shops in Assam in 1889-90 was 1,723, and in 1900-01 the total was only 1,343. In India the total number of shops in 1889-90 was 113,259, and in the year 1900-01 the total was 102,516. The average population per shop in India in 1889-90 was 1,950, whilst in 1900-01 the average was 2,250. If you take merely the shops in which the country liquor to which Mr. Buckingham principally refers is served, the number is only one to 7,000 of the population in India as a whole, whilst in Assam it is one to 26,419 of the population as compared with one shop to only 242 in this country. Therefore, I do not think that the very sweeping indictment which has been made against the Excise Administration by the hon. Gentleman is borne out by the facts. I do not deny that there is a case for inquiry, and the Government has already instituted one, but I do ask the House to believe that the defence I have endeavoured to put before hon. Members is not a mere red-tape apology for the conduct of the Administration, but is fully borne out by an authority whose sympathy with the coolies is beyond suspicion, and who cannot be accused of undue partiality—I mean Sir Henry Cotton. He says—

> "One word in conclusion on the drink question. This is merely a red herring which has been drawn across the discussion to divert attention from its real merits. No one will seriously suppose that I have ever taken steps to encourage drinking. I am thankful that in my time the consumption of opium in Assam has greatly decreased. But I cannot help the growth of the drinking population, which is really the immigrant population of the province. I do not believe I have sanctioned a single new liquor shop, but there has, undoubtedly, been an increase of drinking with the increase of this population."

I do not think that I need to add anything more to the testimony of so competent a witness. I will only say in conclusion that I think the House will prefer to await the result of the inquiry which the Government have already begun rather than accept off-hand the charges which have been made by the hon. Gentleman.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [this day], "That Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair."

Question again proposed.

*(9.0.) SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: Although, like many other hon. Members, I have been waiting impatiently for a turn in this debate, I wish for a moment that an older Member was following upon the noble Lord who spoke last; for he would have, perhaps with greater authority than I can command, congratulated my noble friend on the success of his first speech as Under Secretary for India. The House is not unacquainted with the noble Lord's eloquence, but the power of mastering the details of a technical subject fraught with perplexing considerations which he has exhibited, holds out ample promise for the future, upon which, I am sure, the House will join with me in congratulating him.

Until a very recent date, it seemed highly probable that the large surplus shown in the Financial Statement of the Government of India for the year under review would disappear, and a further severe strain placed on all the spare resources of the country in the effort to relieve the distress from another famine more severe in its character than even those with which it had to combat in recent years. It seemed very likely that not only the population within our own territories in India, but a large portion of the subjects of Native States, would have had to be succoured. If this had happened, I am afraid that the energy of all Indian administrators, and even the attention of this House would have had to be exclusively devoted to devising ways and means for meeting a huge catastrophe. But the timely fall of the monsoon rains this year has changed all this dismal prospect, and the promise of normal, if not abundant, crops, which will enable the country to retrieve the losses of the past years, is a matter for sincere thankfulness, enabling us tonight to turn our attention to many other questions of paramount importance to our fellow-subjects in India. The name of such questions is legion, but it would be idle to treat them wholesale within the limited time at the disposal of this House. Nor would it serve any useful purpose to do so, for I recognise that many of them which have been even mentioned here from time to time in the form of Questions can more fittingly be left to the authorities in India for consideration and disposal. I propose, therefore, to restrict my remarks tonight to three main topics, with regard to which the approval or intervention of Parliament is, in my judgment, likely to prove of solid service. The first of these is embodied in the Motion which stands in my name viz.: "That this House, while viewing with approval the efforts made by the Government of His Excellency Lord Curzon to obtain reports and advice from experts on the subject of starting a scheme of technical instruction for the whole of India, is of opinion that it is desirable, pending the inauguration of a complete scheme, to adopt immediate measures for the preservation, improvement, and encouragement of the existing industrial and agricultural occupations of the people of that country, and to establish classes in connection with existing schools for imparting elementary instruction to students in those pursuits."

It will be observed, Sir, that the first part of this Motion pledges the House to an approval of the steps adopted by Lord Curzon on this important question. No hon. Member who knows how earnestly the Viceroy has entered upon the necessary preliminary inquiry, invited advice from experts, and himself laid down the broad propositions on which such investigation should be conducted and advice tendered, would be prepared to withhold approval of Lord Curzon's action. At the same time, it must be freely admitted that an exhaustive investigation of a subject so complicated by the varying sentiments, needs, and conditions of the different communities which form what is called the Indian population, and the evolution of a complete project for the spread of technical education amongst them, must spread over a great length of time. On the other hand, it is now broadly recognised that every day almost the existing industries of the country are becoming enfeebled, and, in the face of foreign competition, losing ground so rapidly that their very existence is endangered. This may be said more especially of manufactured articles. Recent famines have proved two propositions to demonstration. The first that agricultural occupation is over-manned, and that the proportion of the people dependent mainly on it must be reduced; and that can be done in one way, and one way alone—that is, by opening out other avenues of industry to the tiller of the soil. The other lesson forced upon us by the famines is that the methods of agriculture itself have to be improved. A knowledge of the different qualities of the soil, of its adaptability to the growth of various sorts of crops, of the use of improved implements, and a hundred other subjects allied to the science of agriculture, have to be taught to, at all events, the more intellectual among the large classes of cultivators. I doubt if there is any means in any part of India where the son of even a well-to-do agriculturist or land owner can today obtain the most elementary knowledge of such important subjects. Among the wise proverbs or saws of India in the time of its former civilisation in the pre-British epoch, one which was of general acceptance and most acted upon was embraced in the two words "Oottum Kheti," which meant that of all the callings agriculture was the most precious and best worth following. These words have lost their meaning today; and why? Because in spite of the changed conditions of the times, with a population rapidly multiplying, and their wants and the consequent burden on their resources increasing, the cultivator is left to his ancient methods of eking out a bare subsistence as best he can. It is of the utmost necessity to let in light and intelligence into his dark hut and unchanging lot. One man in a thousand brought up to a scientific training in agriculture, who can analyse the clay, handle an improved harrow, know how to keep his cattle in good condition, and take account of the economic and natural conditions amid which he has to work, would prove a benefactor of the 999 who in normal times live from hand to mouth, and with the first touch of a drought lapse into abject helplessness. But where is this one man to acquire his training? I say, Sir, without fear of contradiction, that there is no means at his disposal for the purpose. True, there are a few classes, sparsely spread in the neighbourhood of some towns, meant to give agricultural instruction. Even if they were efficient, they are not numerous enough: but I go further, and maintain that, owing to the class of people from which the students are drawn, the idea of securing some official post with which they work, and other causes into which I cannot of course enter here, these desultory, heartless experiments yield no substantial results. What we want in India today is a multiplication of such a farm as I had the good fortune to see in Allahabad last January. By the efforts of a single individual, what was once a small farm for the use of the military has in the course of a very few years been turned into a large undertaking, comprising many hundreds of acres of land, and giving employment to a large number of men, a good many of whom were rescued from famines. The organiser of this enterprise was a military officer who had some knowledge originally of agricultural pursuits, which enabled him to develop it, stage by stage, from a small experimental farm into what is today a model and highly reproductive institution, having well-equipped departments for all kinds of dairy produce, and breeding fine stock of cattle which would bear favourable comparison with anything of the kind in this country. This gentleman has not only conquered the difficulties of climate, and introduced such new industries as the manufacture of bacon, but drawn to his work many willing hands from the agriculturists of surrounding districts by his kindly treatment and such concession to their feelings as abstaining from killing cows reared on the farm. It is teachers of this gentleman's type and the instruction which can be obtained on his farm, that India is sorely in need of, and I do not see why what has been shown to be possible in Allahabad should not be multiplied in every province of India. The country should be dotted over with such model farms. Then, with regard to what might be done for training in manufactures on a small scale, I would instance the methods pursued by the American Mission in the Deccan. This mission also rescued a goodly number of waifs and strays in the recent famine years, clothed and fed them, and side by side with giving them the necessary elementary education, trained them to such industries as carpet-weaving and metal work in small workshops attached to their schools. Almost every child put to this sort of training has in a very short time been able to earn enough for its livelihood. This, therefore, is also an object-lesson which might be very widely imitated in connection with many of our smaller schools in India. I mention these matters in support of the Motion to which I have invited the attention of the House, and the sympathetic manner in which it is received will, I feel sure, encourage the Government of Lord Curzon to evolve the larger project of technical instruction to which it is pledged, and also induce it to take immediate measures in the direction I have ventured to suggest.

I now pass on to the second matter to which I consider it necessary to invite the attention of hon. Members. The treatment of the British Indian subjects in South Africa and other colonies has, I am thankful to say, at last evoked the sympathy of the British public, and if they were fully acquainted with the nature of the disabilities imposed upon these our fellow-subjects in certain parts of the Empire, their sense of justice would positively revolt against the stigma unnecessarily cast upon a docile and law-abiding community. I shall briefly recount some of the restrictions imposed on them. A British Indian subject in the Transvaal would be required (*a*) to take out a registration ticket on payment of £3; (*b*) take out a 1s. pass before travelling in a railway carriage; (*c*) not to walk on footpaths; (*d*) not to reside except in certain locations; (*e*) not to own landed property; (*f*) not to trade or farm on his own account; and so forth. These disabilities were imposed on them by the late Boer administration, but with the introduction of our rule they do not seem to have disappeared. And it naturally fills all India with concern that if, when the new Colonies are yet under the direct administration of the Imperial Government, these restrictions are not removed, later on they might be perpetuated. Sir, this sort of legislation by the Boers and in our own Colonies is not based on any economic considerations. It is simply the result of prejudice, aye, of hatred, towards the people of India on the part of the settlers. It is unreasoning and uncalled for. I need not labour this point, because I know that both the Secretaries for India and for the Colonies have looked upon it with disapproval and disgust. And I must here acknowledge with gratitude the promise given by the noble Lord only the other day to a deputation which waited on him, to do all he could to secure redress for this great grievance. I was disappointed that at the Conference of the Colonial Premiers this question was not discussed. But during the forthcoming visit of the Colonial Secretary to Africa, I trust the right hon. Gentleman will make it a point to discuss it on the spot, and induce the Colonial authorities to extend that fair treatment to the Indian subjects of His Majesty which has been heretofore denied them. It is said that the Colonies being self-governing, the Imperial Government is unable to interfere in this matter. I cannot admit that plea. Self-government carries with it certain rights, but it also imposes certain responsibilities. And if the Colonies refuse to recognise the responsibility of treating India with justice and with courtesy, in accordance with the pledges given to her people by the Crown for equal treatment and fair play, they are trampling upon the noble and sacred traditions of the British Constitution. I still hope that the combined action of the Secretaries for India and the Colonies will induce them to desist, and that the great personal influence of the Colonial Minister and the good sense of the better classes of the Colonies will prevail over the prejudice of the lower population, which is at the bottom of this harsh treatment of their Indian fellow-subjects. If this expectation is not soon realised, then I submit, and I do so with regret, that it will be the duty of the noble Lord, as the protector of the rights and liberties of the people of India, to call upon the Indian administration to adopt such reciprocity in legislation as may place the people of those Colonies under the same ban in India that they persist in imposing upon her people within their own jurisdiction. That, at all events, will serve to protect the loyal and unoffending millions of His Majesty's Indian Empire from the slur which the legislature of the Colonies has sought to cast on them as unfit to enjoy the ordinary rights of British citizens.

In referring to the third subject which I wished to submit to the consideration of the House, I am glad that the statement made by the noble Lord already with regard to it enables me to dispense with any long argument. If the increased scale of pay of the British soldier sanctioned by this House were to be levied from the Indian Exchequer also, it would impose a fresh burden which India can ill bear, nor ought she in justice to be asked to bear. I note with satisfaction that the noble Lord is in agreement with the Government of India in resisting the claim put forward on this head by the War Office, and that the difference is referred to the arbitration of the Lord Chief Justice. I therefore do not feel at liberty to discuss this question, beyond expressing a fervent hope that in the consideration of it the contribution of India to the military needs of the Empire, and the help she has ungrudgingly given in men and material resources to it in times of stress, will be fully taken into account. Lord Curzon voiced the sentiment of the whole of the people of India when in his masterly speech on the last Budget he said in reference to this subject—

> "We beg that the part played by India in the Imperial system, and the services rendered by us in time of trouble, may not be forgotten by the British nation, and that they may find in it, when the occasion arises, good grounds for reciprocal generosity and help."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would associate myself with my noble friend in the splendid sentiments he has expressed with reference to the great Coronation Durbar to be held at Delhi next month. His unstinted tribute to the loyalty of the Princes and people of India, of which he has had personal experience, will be highly appreciated by them, as from my own life-long experience I can say it is fully deserved. And apart from the grandeur and magnificence of the historical function to which they look forward with pleasure, I am sure that its true inwardness, as explained by him to the House, will strike the minds of the chiefs and the population at large, and bind them in still closer attachment to the throne and person of the King-Emperor. I thank the House for the sympathy with which it has listened to the few questions which I have submitted to its consideration as bearing in the immediate future on their well-being, and I trust therefore it will endorse an appeal which I think it right to make to His Majesty's Government. The Secretary of State has spoken in the highest terms of praise, but none too high, of the work done by Lord Curzon during the four years of his Viceroyalty. He has penetrated into every detail of the Indian administration, grasped the most complicated questions with an ability unsurpassed by any of his predecessors, and without seeking popularity, has treated the people of India with such sympathy and frankness that he has become endeared to them. With the view of solving many problems of internal administration, and devising schemes of general benefit, he has appointed Commissions and instituted inquiries on many subjects. It will take some time before these investigations are completed, and before the work of construction to be based upon their results can be undertaken. I am afraid the one year left to his term of office will not suffice for that purpose. And my appeal to Government is to consider whether it would not be right to induce Lord Curzon to stay a couple of years beyond that term in India. No one can deal better with the conclusions of the inquiries I have alluded to than the author of them, so that his longer tenure, while it would be a well-deserved compliment to his sterling ability and successful administration, would secure to the people of India the fruition of those seeds which he has sown for the last four years with unceasing energy for their benefit.

* (9.50.) MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I am sure that many Members on both sides of the House must have shared the honest indignation which the hon. Member for North East Bethnal Green has given expression to in regard to the treatment which some of our Indian fellow-subjects have met with in South Africa. I beg to congratulate the noble Lord the Under Secretary for India on the success of his Ministerial *début*, and I hope that whenever his Party is in power that speech will only be a prelude to a long and distinguished career. I want to deal with certain larger aspects of the position in India. I feel some doubt as to the extraordinary prosperity which India is supposed to be enjoying at the present time, although I shall be only too glad if my doubt can be removed. The noble Lord the Secretary for India was very positive as to the prosperity of India.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: All I said was that there were indications of reviving prosperity.

* MR. EMMOTT: I am very glad to hear the noble Lord's explanation, and I am very sorry if I have in any way misrepresented him. A very careful study of this year's Financial Statement has left me dubious on the point of the prosperity of India. There was a huge surplus last year, and a smaller surplus in the three previous years, and yet all these surpluses have been whittled away (except £800,000) on fresh expenditure, while there has been no important remission of taxation. We are always told of the danger of counting on the continuance of last year's prosperity. What struck me in regard to this year's Financial Statement is that it speaks with two voices. That was my general impression on the first reading of it, and I think it was a fair one. The general impression is confirmed by a study in detail, and I would like to enter into some length in regard to two matters. First, as regards Customs. On page 5 of the Financial Statement, paragraph 15, it is said—

> "Now we have heard a good many arguments about the poverty or prosperity of India; but I have not seen or heard any founded on the growth or falling off of our imports. And yet, what greater test can there be of progress or decay than the consuming and purchasing power of a people? India has this year shown clearly that its consuming and purchasing power is rapidly increasing, and when we examine the classes of articles for which this increasing demand has mainly arisen, and for which this increasing purchasing power has been found, it is evident that it is not the wants or the contents of the pockets of the European population that have appreciably affected the result. It must be admitted by the most sceptical that it is the requirements and the purchasing power of the indigenous population which are alone practically responsible for the satisfactory results attained. We have here then a definite fact which cannot be explained away."

And yet, if one looks at page 9 of the Statement, paragraph 36, the explanation is found. It says—

> "We can hardly expect the extraordinary increase under this head, already noted and commented upon, to be consistently maintained, and it would seem prudent to allow for the possibility of even some falling off in Customs receipts next year. It must be remembered that we have no means of ascertaining with certainty whether the market is overstocked or otherwise with such articles as piece goods and petroleum. We accordingly take, as compared with 1901 and 1902, the reduced figures of £3,600,000."

The House will see that these two statements really modify one another very considerably. On the question of railways, it is stated that the chief increase arises from two railways which could not be counted on for the future; while in another paragraph it is said that there was an all-round increase which may be counted on in the future.

I think I have proved that the Statement does speak with two voices. But is there any reason for these two voices? I think that if the present year's surplus is largely a currency surplus, and is due to a cause which has operated against the prosperity of trade in India, then both voices are amply justified. I am going to show that the surplus this year is only in small part due to the prosperity of India. I mean that the prosperity of India relatively to other countries is a subject of the gravest doubt. For twenty years before 1895 there was a steadily falling rupee. This was good for trade. It stimulated the export trade, but it was bad for the Indian Government which had to pay the interest on Indian loans in gold. The falling rupee also meant the diminution of the income of officials, part of whose salaries had to be remitted home in gold. The flow of capital from England was likewise impeded by the constantly falling exchange. There were sometimes deficits, and there were constantly fears of deficits. These fears were often exaggerated; and there was no better proof of that than that in the year 1895-96—the first of the cotton duties—there was a surplus greater than the cotton duties provided. But still there is no doubt of the fact that new taxes were needed during these twenty years; and they were imposed to the extent of between £5,000,000 and £6,000,000. The principal items of increase were the income tax in 1886; salt tax in June 1888; the 5 per cent. duty of 1893–94, and the cotton duties early in 1895. Now, when these later taxes were put on, each drop of 1d. in the rupee meant one and a half crores, roughly speaking, or £1,000,000 sterling, and all this new taxation has been kept on. Is it difficult to understand why the Government of India is prosperous? The rupee came down to 1s. 6d., 1s. 4d., 1s. 3d. and 1s. 1d., and fresh taxes were put on when the rupee was at 1s. 1d., and the new taxes were kept on when the rupee rose to 1s. 4d. In 1895–96 the average rate for bills was 1s. 1·6381d., and there was then a surplus of one and a half crores, or £1,000,000. The mere rise of the rupee to 1s. 4d. means a surplus this year of £3,400,000. If that were added to the cost which the Indian Exchequer saved last year by the large use made of the Indian troops in South Africa, the large balance mentioned by the noble Lord would be arrived at. At any rate, so long as the extra taxation for the great fall of the rupee from 1892 to 1895 is kept on, there must, in ordinary years, be a big surplus, unless India is positively going backwards. One must, therefore, treat that question of the prosperity of India by other criteria than that of the Government Financial Statement.

Now I come to the second point—the question of whether, having regard to other criteria, India is advancing or not. Here let me say that I see no reason to doubt that India is advancing slowly. I am no pessimist on this matter: but the question of prosperity is a relative question. Generally all nations are advancing in prosperity. The question of whether India is advancing relatively with others is the point on which I wish to say a few words. First, Did India's trade behave like others in the gross, and second, how is it now in detail? The great facts of the last decade are that there was bad trade from 1890 to 1895, and an extraordinary increase of prosperity from 1895 to 1900. I take the foreign trade of India as a whole, and compare it with that of the four gold standard countries—England, Germany, France and the United States, for the two quinquennial periods—1890–95 and 1895–1900. In the first period the foreign trade of England decreased 6 per cent.; of Germany 1 per cent., of France 13 per cent., and of the United States 7 per cent., whilst that of India increased 9 per cent. This was when there was a falling rupee in India, and the country was faced with bankruptcy. Now take the second period—1895–1900—the foreign trade of England increased 25 per cent., of Germany 40 per cent., of France 25 per cent., and of the United States 50 per cent., whilst that of India only increased by a beggarly 1 per cent. There is no other civilised country that I know of in which the foreign trade increased so little. Take any other criteria of prosperity; population: that did not increase largely; the salt tax: there was a greater increase in that between 1890 and 1895 than since. On page 208 of the Financial Statement, Sir E. Law, complaining of some statistics used by Mr. Gokhale says—

> "It is clear that, for a fair comparison, exceptional periods of famine should be excluded, I think that a comparison between two seven-year periods (normal agricultural cycles) excluding very recent famines, would be much more reasonable. If we take two such successive periods 1882–83 to 1888–89 and 1889–90 to 1895–96 that is to say up to the date of the first terrible famine, we find that all my

hon. colleague's calculations are entirely upset, and the results, following his method are in many cases completely reversed."

But that explanation entirely ignores the whole point of the case. The point of Mr. Gokhale's case is that the raising of the rupee from 1s. 1d. to 1s. 4d. had, at any rate during the time it was in operation, been practically a contraction of the currency of India, which must have told, as it did tell, on the producing revenue of India; and any comparison between two periods entirely misses the point of Mr. Gokhale's criticism.

If I had had more time I should have liked to treat all the numerous trades in detail; but, as it is, I will only refer to one or two. It is true that the coal trade has been satisfactory; but that is only a small matter. Again, although the acreage under jute has decreased, the jute trade is still flourishing. It is also stated that cotton has found a ready sale. Of course it has, because of the great shortage of cotton in the markets of the world; but there is no tendency to increase the acreage of the land producing cotton in India. With regard to the cotton industry generally, it is stated that it is a little better. That is perfectly true; but what I wish to remind the House of is that up to the time of the currency changes there was an interrupted increase, but that since these changes were introduced there has been the most serious crisis in the cotton industry in India that has ever occurred since its foundation. I have looked recently at the report of six mills of Greaves, Cotton & Co., and in these mills, after a deduction for depreciation, there was a loss last year of 405,535 rupees or an average of £4,500 sterling per annum for each mill. I should like in this connection to read an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Moses, who is a commercial member of the Government of Bombay's Council. At the annual meeting of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Moses said—

> "Our mill industry, in which no less than fifteen million sterling is invested, which was flourishing before the closing of the mills, has since been gradually decaying, until it has now reached the brink of bankruptcy. No less than fourteen mills are about to be liquidated, and some of them, brand new ones, were knocked down at the hammer realising only one-third of their original cost."

One of the difficulties of this matter is that silver is still dropping in the Far East; and so the trade of India with the Far East is further jeopardised. Mr. Moses proceeds—

> "Our exchanges with the Far East have been following in the wake of silver on the lower basis, thus rendering our trade with that country (China) unprofitable. This has been going on year by year until the trade is now almost paralysed. The mills are obliged to export to China what they produce, whether on their own account or by selling to the China merchants; but the results to all concerned have been all the same unremunerative, as they were not able to obtain sufficiently high dollar prices from John Chinaman commensurate with the fall in exchange."

I wish the House to understand that that is the opinion of one of the chief commercial men in India at the present time.

I will not weary the House with details of other trades, although I should liked to deal with them. I shall, however, be naturally asked what is the conclusion I draw from the facts I have stated. It is a very simple one. I think that the raising of the rupee to 1s. 4d. has helped the Government of India, but that there is another side to the question. I think the raising of the rupee has caused a contraction of the currency, which has been bad for the producing classes of India—perhaps only temporarily bad, but it has been bad; and is sure to tell and indeed has told in the misfortunes which have overtaken some of the great export trades of India. In the Government Financial Statement we read of overflowing coffers, and they are inclined to minimise the disastrous effect of the currency changes on commerce. Yet an uneasy feeling that all is not well peeps out in the official Financial Statement, if it be read carefully. Do I seek to restore the old currency system in India? Certainly not. But I do urge that there should be an inquiry into the effect of the currency changes in India on the trade of India. There are certain patent considerations which ought to be inquired into. In the first place, trade has been bad in India while it has been good elsewhere. That is a somewhat serious matter. Secondly, capital is not flowing into India, although we were told that if the rupee were stable capital would follow it. Capital has not flown into India because it cannot obtain a reasonable return. Lastly, the present state of the currency cannot be permanent, and has certain dangers of its own which cannot be ignored. The standard of India is the most extraordinary in the world. It is neither gold nor silver nor irredeemable paper. It is irredeemable silver with a fancy value given to it, at the suggestion of a Royal Commission, by the fiat of the Government of India; and yet some people are still alive in the world who think you cannot alter the value of currency by legislation or administration. But there are possible dangers in regard to the Indian currency. Silver is still falling; the chasm between the rupee and the intrinsic value of silver is widening; and that interferes with our national market in the Far East. There is also another serious danger in a country where the people are experts in metal work. There is danger of illicit coinage, on which there is a profit of 50 per cent. to the coiner who is not discovered. I want to urge in relation to this matter that as the raising of the rupee has helped the Government of India, and has, at all events temporarily, injured the trade of India, the Government should now help trade by a reduction of taxation. More money may be required for education and sanitation, but the chief need is the reduction of taxation. Next year we shall probably have another large surplus; but there are many taxes which urgently require to be dealt with. There is, for instance, the income tax on small incomes. I think it is a great pity that income tax is raised in India on incomes over 500 rupees; I believe that if the limit of taxable incomes could be increased, a great deal of the blackmail now levied by certain of the assessors would be immediately stopped, inasmuch as men with incomes of 1,000 rupees would be better able to look after themselves and resist blackmail than a man with only an income of 500 rupees. Then the Excise duty on cotton goods is greatly complained of; as are also the import duties. The Secretary of State is doubly and trebly pledged to deal with this question, when the time comes for the remission of taxation. I do not say that it should be the first tax to be remitted. I believe that the remission of the increase in the salt tax should precede it. Lancashire is supposed to be very selfish in regard to these import duties; but I, as a Lancashire Member, would be prepared to remit the extra salt tax before I would remit the cotton duties. However, as far as I can see, there will be a sufficient surplus to deal with both before very long. In regard to this matter, I naturally rebut the charge of selfishness on the part of Lancashire; and I would invite hon. Members opposite who are landowners, and who supported the Agricultural Rates Act, to throw stones at Lancashire if they can. Only a few months ago the noble Lord, at a distribution of prizes at Coopers Hill, used this observation—

> "So far as outward appearances were concerned the Indian Government had steadily advanced in the path of progress and higher civilisation. But, on the other hand, he had an unpleasant feeling in his mind that, notwithstanding all this great progress, the relations between governed and Government had not improved in a corresponding ratio."

That is a very serious statement as coming from the noble Lord, and I only want to say in reference to it, that we ought as far as possible to consult the wishes of India in order to avoid any unnecessary friction. The question of the expense of the reception of the native princes is eminently a case in point. The noble Lord has put a new view on that question now; but it is a pity that the suggestion was ever made that that expense should be charged on the Treasury of India. Then there is the question of increased military expenditure. That is a very difficult question; but I do not think that the present is a very suitable time, if it can be avoided, for any large increase in military expenditure in India. There is another small question which is causing a great deal of trouble in India. I think I mentioned it two years ago, and that is, that owing to the fall in the price in silver, natives, when they want to realise their ornaments, get very much less for them than they did before the price of silver dropped, and they are also very often defrauded by native dealers who make a profit out of the ornaments. That is a little question arising out of the currency changes, but it is causing a great deal of friction in India.

I must apologise, Sir, for the length at which I have detained the House; but it is very difficult to speak on Indian questions at any reasonable length. I hope I have not dealt with the subject in any partisan spirit. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton once said, "We are all Members for India," but sometimes I think good friends of India have asked too much in the way of heroic measures and drastic changes. It seems to me that it is not a question of heroic measures or drastic changes, but a question of close attention to detail at a time when it is necessary to give the utmost attention to the development of the commerce and industries of India. I am encouraged by the greater interest shown in this debate tonight. I believe that there is rising up in this country and in this House a set of men who are willing to push reform in India on moderate lines, who are as free from sentimentalism as from selfishness, and who aim only at the good of India, and through that at the good of the Empire at large.

*(10.15.) SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): I am in the unfortunate position of differing from a great many of the views put forward in the interesting speech which has just been delivered. The hon. Gentleman who has just spoken threw doubt on the reality of the prosperity of India. It appears to me that that prosperity is absolutely proved, first of all by the large figures of imports, the largest on record; by the high level at which the exports of India have been maintained, notwithstanding alterations in currency; and, still further, by the continued increase in the amount of treasure imported every year. The hon. Member is further inclined to attribute the absence of prosperity to the recent currency reform. I venture to lay before the House the view that the prosperity of India has been enormously enhanced by the great reforms which have been adopted by the Government, on the recommendation of the Committee presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. I believe that the prosperity of India has been for many years obscured—if I may use the term—by the violent fluctuations in exchange previous to the reform enacted two years ago, and that the real prosperity of the country was perhaps greater than it appeared on the surface. But it is only since the exchange has been fixed at a comparatively steady level that the world has been able to perceive what the real advance of India has been. The hon. Gentleman, although he disbelieved in the prosperity of India, suggested to the Government that they should lose no time in reducing taxation. It appears to me that if the surplus is based on such an insecure foundation as he suggests, it is somewhat illogical to suppose that the Government should abandon a considerable portion of their revenue. On this particular point, I venture also with great diffidence to differ from the view expressed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. He also pressed the Secretary of State to lose no time in conceding a large reduction in, or perhaps the abolition of, the salt tax.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The removal of the excess duty.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT: Yes; and I am with the right hon. Gentleman so far that, when the time comes for the reduction of taxation, I willingly concede that the salt tax is one which deserves the attention of the Indian Government. But I venture to suggest that India has only within the last two years recovered her financial prosperity. She has been through a very long period, I will not say of unsound, but of insecure and doubtful finance, and I would urge on the noble Lord that no measure for the diminution of the revenues of the Indian Government should be entertained until financial prosperity is established on a sound and secure basis. I would venture to lay before the House three grounds on which I base my suggestion. The first is that it is admitted on all sides that an elastic administration of the land tax is among the most important requirements of the prosperity of the country; and to administer the land tax in an elastic manner you require to have a large surplus of revenue to pull and haul. If you are pushed to make both ends meet, you are compelled, in order to get in revenue, to press in provinces where you had much better make remissions. The second reason is that we had from the noble Lord tonight the statement that the indebtedness of the peasantry of India has largely increased, and that special measures may be required in order to meet this growing evil. These measures can only be by the remission of revenue, and in an elastic administration of the whole scheme of taxation. My third reason is that the danger in India of maintaining taxation at a comparatively high level is incomparably less than the danger, having once remitted taxation, of having to re-impose it. In an Oriental country there is no measure so likely to cause discontent, so likely to throw suspicion on the wisdom of the Government, as what I might term fiddling with taxation. First reducing taxation and then increasing it upsets the balance of your Budget and destroys the confidence of the tax-paying population in your wisdom. In dealing with the tax-paying community in India, and with the general wealth of the country, it must never be forgotten that we have there a population which is not only poor but which is also improvident. In European countries a succession of good crops, a year or two of prosperity, increases the power of the people to resist subsequent troubles that may come upon them; but in India the increase of capital and all the reserve forces produced by two or three years of prosperity are incomparably less. As the taxpayer, as an individual and as a community, is improvident, so, I submit, the Government must to a certain extent be provident and farseeing for him, and the necessity which, I think, lies on all Governments of creating reserves is particularly important in the case of the Indian Government.

Now, although the noble Lord has stated that the accumulated surplus of the last three years, including the currency reserve, was something between eleven and eighteen millions sterling, yet I believe the real invested funds do not exceed three and a half millions. May I suggest to the Indian Government as a possible policy and as a wise policy that, except in cases of great urgency, or of taxes which bear with exceptional injustice on the population, they should, as far as possible, aim at creating a reserve of ten millions sterling in the currency and reserve ten millions sterling in the famine reserve; and when they have these accumulated reserves it will be then time enough to consider in what way the taxation of the country can be best diminished and the tax-paying community relieved. There is another question on which I would venture to submit a few observations. The hon. Gentleman opposite spoke of the desirability of increasing interest in this House in the administration of our Indian Empire; and I think the general tone this evening has been in the direction of a desire for increased facilities for debate. I ventured to submit that discussion in the House, interesting though it has been, particularly this evening, is necessarily rather discursive, and hardly any of the points touched are thoroughly elucidated. I would submit, as an alternative proposal, if increased attention to Indian affairs is desirable, that that increased attention should be given either in the form of further examination by Select Committees on specific problems of Indian administration, or that we should revert to the old system in vogue at the time of the East India Company. Previous to 1858 each renewal of the Charter of the Company, which was every twenty years, was preceded by a thorough examination of the progress of India and of the development of Indian administration during the preceding period. I will not weary the House with an enumeration of the distinguished Members who have served on these Commissions; but almost every name of great eminence in the House of Commons during the first half of the nineteenth century would be found on the records of these Commissions. Peel, Wellington, Disraeli, Gladstone, Palmerston, and Cobden formed part of them. Whether a period of twenty years be too long or too short, I submit that there would be a very real advantage in considering the possibility of re-establishing an examination of this kind. I have no doubt that it would tend to the advantage of all parties; the people of India would see in it a guarantee of fairness, and even of generosity; this country would obtain a guarantee that its benevolent intentions towards India were executed; the Indian administration, which I believe to be one of the most beneficent of human institutions, would place in a clear light the fact that they are the protectors and not the oppressors of the people of India, their guardians rather than their masters, and that they do their utmost to secure the prosperity of the vast population committed to their care.

*(10.30.) LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The understanding which was arrived at at an earlier hour was, I think, that this debate should close in time to allow the Appropriation Bill to be considered, and I rise now only to answer the several questions that have been put to me. The right hon. Gentleman expressed his dissatisfaction with the existing system of administration and promotion of railways in India. I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman. One part of the administration in India with which I am least satisfied is that which relates to the promotion of railways. The Government of India is not an easy machine to work, but, though the machinery is somewhat cumbrous, I doubt whether we could devise a better system for dealing with the multifarious affairs which have to be settled by the Viceroy and the Council in India, and the Secretary of State and the Council in London. But the two tribunals are eminently disqualified from dealing with commercial questions which require a prompt reply. The railways are either State managed or managed by companies with agents in India and directors in England, and the consequence is that that there is a see-saw, a shuttlecock kind of transaction going on which is almost inevitable in the circumstances, and which I think has been an obstacle to private enterprise promoting railroads such as might not have been the case had another system prevailed. Eighteen months ago we appointed a gentleman of great experience—Mr. Robertson—to investigate into the management of railways. He has devoted a great deal of time to that question, assisted by the officials in India. Mr. Robertson has been to America to look into the working of the railway system there, and now he is about to proceed to India to make his final Report. On that Report, Lord Curzon will have suggestions to make, and they will probably go in the direction of excluding, as far as possible, railway administration from the general administration of the Government, so as to get gentlemen who are experts to devote their time and attention to this particular business without being mixed up in the other multifarious transactions of the Government. I am confident that we will never get private enterprise to embark in railways in India unless a more prompt reply can be given to the suggestions which are made. The question, however, is not an easy one, because the security at present for all railway enterprise is the security of the Indian Revenues, and, therefore, it is impossible altogether to disconnect railway finance from the general finance of India. But the Government will travel as far as they possibly can in the direction suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, and I think that this will be in accordance with the views of men of business. I think that I heard in the speech of the hon. Member for Oldham a little echo of the Bi-metallic League. A good many of the propositions put forward are familiar to us. [MR. EMMOTT: "The noble lord was a sympathiser in the old days."] We sometimes get wiser as we grow older. But the hon. Member criticised the standard of value in India. A remark was made the other day by an Indian official, the head of the Statistical Department. He said that during the past year the exchange value of the rupee had been as stable inside and outside India as the exchange value of the silver coins in currency in France. I do not think that we can pay a higher compliment to the system established in India. When we are told that a fall in exchange encourages trade and a stable exchange discourages trade, I would point out that the falling rupee only encourages trade so long as it is falling. When it stops, the matter re-adjusts itself; and I do not believe that any community could benefit by a constantly-depreciating currency. On the contrary, I believe that a depreciating currency which favours exports is nothing more nor less than a legal system of sweating for those who are engaged in the export trade.

MR. EMMOTT: I hope I did not convey that I favoured a constantly falling exchange.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The hon. Gentleman contended that a stable standard would be a check on trade.

MR. EMMOTT: A rising rupee.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The export and import trade is now higher than ever. I never believe that a rising and falling rupee can be a benefit to trade, because it disturbes the whole foundation on which people make their calculations. There has been no fluctuation during the past year. The hon. member for Exeter, speaking with that great authority which comes to one who has had great experience in Eastern finance, deprecated the reduction of taxation and advised the Government to persevere in the direction of establishing great reserves. I agree with my hon. friend that we ought not lightly to part with any portion of existing taxation until we are perfectly sure that we can permanently dispense with it. If we remove any portion of taxation, we cannot put it on again without causing considerable discontent; and I can, therefore, assure the House that we shall act with all precaution before we considerably diminish any of our existing sources of taxation.

My hon. friend also suggested that it would be advisable that certain questions should be referred to a Committee, who might have time thoroughly to investigate them. I have never objected to the appointment of a Committee if the question into which it was to inquire was a definite matter of immediate importance, but I have the strongest objection to a Parliamentary Committee for a mere "fishing" inquiry. Such a Committee does an infinity of harm; it brings up officials and disturbs them in the transaction of regular business, and, after a time, it results in the least influential members of the Committee occupying the time and attention of probably the most influential members of different Administrations, very much to the detriment of the public service. With regard to the inquiry which was held before the charter of the East India Company was renewed, a great deal of the evidence was written, and the oral evidence was very small, and I would point out that the members of that Committee, including such distinguished men of marked ability and genius as the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Disraeli, had far less means of informing themselves as regards what was going on than lesser people of the present day. Therefore, it does not seem to me to be desirable to substitute an inquiry of that kind unless some special subject is to be investigated which the Indian Government or the Indian officials cannot satisfactorily investigate for themselves.

As regards the allegation of my having described India as a very prosperous country, I disclaim having ever used language capable of that description. All I said was that all the evidence went to show that the condition of the general mass of the population was upward and not downward, and that, judging by all the tests that could be applied, the taxation did not sit so heavily on the people of India as seriously to curtail the development of industries. India has passed through a very exceptional period. It really seems as if the rain arrangements of a considerable part of the universe have altogether got out of gear. Australia has suffered for seven years, India has suffered for six years running; in Siam, in Central Asia, and in Persia there have been the same extraordinary climatic disturbances. I can only hope that we have got to the end of the cycle of disturbance, and that, if India is vouchsafed for a few years a normal rainfall, we shall be able considerably to assist that country hereafter either by reduction of taxation or other ameliorative measures. I hope the House will now conclude this discussion, in accordance with the understanding, and pass on to the next business.

SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester) said he hoped the noble Lord would agree to the Adjournment of the Debate, as there were still a considerable number of questions to be discussed.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) said he wished to ask the noble Lord what was the definite policy of the Government with reference to the protection of labourers. The whole question had been for many years in the melting pot; and no one seemed to know yet what the definite policy of the Government was. The Government had now decided that the cost of entertaining the Indian visitors to England should be put on the National Exchequer; and he was delighted that the Government at the eleventh hour had arrived at that decision. With regard to the Durbar, £267,000 had been already added to the estimates for expenditure in connection with it. It was to be one of the grandest functions ever held in India; and even the entertainment which King Solomon extended to the Queen of Sheba would only be a side-show to it. He should like to associate himself with the remarks which fell from his hon. friend the Member for the Camborne Division. He believed there was to be a Commission to inquire into the questions to which his hon. friend referred; and it might be proper that other forms of taxation in India should also be inquired into.

*MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire) said it was very unfortunate that the Government should have curtailed the day usually allotted to the Indian Budget. Two days should be given for the discussion, in order that the details of questions connected with the prosperity of India might be considered. By that means hon. Members with a practical knowledge of India could not be squeezed out by hon. Members who delivered long-spun-out essays on every variety of subject. He hoped that even now the noble Lord would agree to the discussion being continued, holding over the Appropriation Bill until next day. He had given notice of a Motion to call attention to the Report of the Famine Commission of 1901, and to move that the Indian Government be encouraged to act immediately on its recommendations, especially those referring to an increase of the means of irrigation; and that the Commission now dealiing with this subject should be specially instructed to thoroughly investigate the question of irrigation works in some parts of India on a similar scale to that of the recently constructed works in the Nile Valley. When this subject was discussed on the previous occasion, one hon. Member moved an Amendment in a speech occupying an hour and three-quarters, and raised such a number of points that the Secretary of State had to reply at great length, which left only one hour for all the other Members. He thought the attention of the House should be called to the question, especially as the Government of India had ignored the Reports of two of its Famine Commissions by giving preference to railways and starving canals—an erroneous policy which was still being pursued. Before dealing particularly with that subject, he wished to say a few words in opposition to the pessimistic remarks of hon. Members opposite, with regard to the economic condition of India. The increase in the revenues from Customs, Post-office and railways proved the opposite; and the Question put by the hon. Member for Ross elicited the important information that between 1881 and 1891 land under cultivation in India had increased from 194,000,000 acres to 217,000,000 acres. Seeing that India was an agricultural country, he thought that was good proof of its general progress. He wished to congratulate the Secretary of State on having been for two years in a position to put before the House more successful Budgets than had ever been introduced by any of his predecessors. That result was very much due to the introduction of the gold standard, which had conferred incalculable benefits on India; and instead of deficits they now had encouraging surpluses. In a word, it raised the financial position of India to the same plane as that of the great commercial countries of the world. He thought also that the Secretary of State would be very much gratified that the courageous policy which was pursued by the India Office in imposing countervailing duties on sugar, had been one of the indirect causes of the arrangement arrived at at the Brussels Convention, whereby bounties on sugar were to be altogether abolished. That would confer a large amount of benefit on a considerable section of the inhabitants of this country, as well as on the sugar planters in the Colonies. He thought that the India Office might well be proud of having taken the initial decisive step in this movement, which was energetically supported by the Colonial Secretary, and carried to success by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Before proceeding further he wished to know if the discussion would be continued.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member appeals to me, it is not a question of order; it is a question of arrangement.

MR. WYLIE said that he would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Wylie.*)

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

(11.0.) MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) objected to the form of the Bill. It was, he contended, an entirely new departure, and the House ought to take care that the proper forms were duly observed. The Bill was drawn on a wrong principle. For this unusual Appropriation Bill as much as possible of the old Appropriation Bills had been taken; from the title-page to the schedule it appeared to be distinctly out of order. He hoped that the Committee stage would not be rushed through, so that there would be ample time to discuss the drafting of the measure.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that it was a matter of regret that the right hon. gentleman principally concerned in this Bill was not present to answer the questions which might properly be raised respecting the administration of his Department. The Colonial Secretary was in the House when the Bill was called on, and he immediately left when the discussion began. He protested against this continual practice of the right hon. Gentleman, who, when Members who did not exactly suit his political attitude got up to discuss Colonial affairs, showed his courtesy to the House and to hon. Members by leaving the Chamber. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] It was not a question of no; it was a question of fact. In the absence of the Colonial Secretary he would confine his remarks to points with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to deal. He congratulated the Government on having secured, in connection with the Bill, an unanimous Vote for money for South Africa. That was a new departure, and he hoped it was an indication that in the future South Africa would be treated less as a Party matter, and more as one affecting the Empire at large. He desired to join in the protest of his hon. friend against the character and form of the Bill. As it stood, the Auditor General and the Treasury authorities would not be able to exercise proper control over the money. The Bill by which they would be governed, provided that £8,000,000 should be granted for necessities following upon the war in South Africa. Why was there no schedule in this Bill as in the Appropriation Act passed early in the year, in which the sums were set out in their particular class, and the purposes for which they were passed in Committee named? He also asked for some indication as to the time when the House could be informed exactly as to their responsibility in regard to the expenditure in South Africa. Might they expect a complete statement before the return of the Colonial Secretary?

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) admitted that it was very difficult for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reply to questions of detail with regard to the Vote, and, therefore, he thought they might fairly regret that the Colonial Secretary was absent. He wished to ask a question as to the receipts given by the Boer Government for forage and animals to their own people. Was an engagement made by the terms of peace that those receipts would be recognised by the British Government? He was given to understand that in a great many cases these receipts had been destroyed by the English commanders. In such cases, would secondary evidence be allowed which would show that the Boer Government had given these receipts and had received a *quid pro quo?* A further point was that a large amount had been paid by the Colonial Office to the War Office for cattle distributed by them. As a great number of animals were taken from the Boers themselves and therefore cost nothing, he wished to know whether payment had been made for them, and whether they were put down as having cost something.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham) said that complaint had been made of the form in which the Appropriation Bill had been brought before the House. No doubt this was a somewhat unusual and exceptional Bill, but on examination it would be found that it followed the general lines of Appropriation Bills, and that all the information usually given was given in it. The Vote in Committee of Supply consisted of a single Resolution, and then, for the better information of the House, a good many items were given, which were discussed in Committee. But it was the Vote that was resolved upon—not the items—that was put in the Appropriation Bill. That course had been followed in the present Bill. He saw no advantage in having a schedule of the various items. In the Vote for Colonial Services this session, the original Estimates included many different grants in aid of Colonial services—about twenty sub-heads—and a supplementary grant in aid of £220,000 for the West India sugar Colonies, but they were all lumped together in the Appropriation Bill. There would be no difficulty in the Controller and Auditor General following out the whole of the expenditure. As to when the House would know the full amount of the country's responsibility for this money, no exact time could be named, but the Colonial Office had said that there was not likely to be any unexpended balance.

MR. DALZIEL said the hon. Member had not appreciated the point of his question. What he wanted to know was when there would be a full statement with regard, not only to this, but to the other expenditure in South Africa.

MR. HAYES FISHER said that was a much wider question, and he doubted whether anyone could answer it.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Tomorrow.

MILITIA AND YEOMANRY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

(11.27.) MR. CALDWELL (Lancashire, Mid) said that the Government ought to have given some explanation of this measure, which was one of the most extraordinary ever introduced into the House in connection with the Army. This Bill introduced a novel principle into the administration of the Army, in that it proposed to give absolute control of the Reserve forces to the Secretary of State. The House had made certain conditions and enactments with reference to the Militia Reserve, but under this Bill the Secretary of State would be able to relax any regulation or dispense with the provisions of any enactment relating to the training of the Militia and Yeomanry. That was a strong power to ask from this House; there was no precedent for it, and he objected most strongly to giving such a power to any Department of State. Why did they not ask for the same power in regard to the Army? This proposal seemed to him to be the thin end of the wedge. First they got the principle established, and then they applied it to some other cases. He did not see why the Secretary of State for War should have unlimited power to relax every Act that had been passed with regard to the Militia.

MR. BRODRICK: The Clause to which the hon. Member takes exception only refers to any enactment relating to the training of the Militia.

MR. CALDWELL said that training was practically the whole service of the Militia, and maintained that his argument was not affected by the Secretary for War's interruption. Some day they would find that instead of the men being trained in accordance with the Acts of Parliament they would be trained under the regulations of the Secretary of State for War. He would like the right hon.

Gentleman to tell the House whether there was any precedent for such a course.

MR. DALZIEL complained that a Bill of such importance had been brought in at this period of the evening without any explanation whatever of the objects and character of the measure. He objected to the measure being taken now because it had come on unexpectedly, and many of their authorities on Army administration had left the House, on the understanding that other business would be taken. He understood that there were several other non-contentious measures on the Paper which might very well be taken. It could not possibly be defended to take a Bill of this importance so unexpectedly, for it was a measure which placed into the hands of the Secretary of State for War a very important power which ought to be most carefully exercised, for it altered many of their important regulations with regard to the Army Reserve. It was far too important a matter to expect for a single moment that a mere informal debate was going to settle matters of such far-reaching importance. He protested against the Bill being taken now. The right hon. Gentleman knew that the best way to pass a Bill of this kind was to accede to the request for an adjournment of the debate, and then on some future occasion the House would be able to have a proper statement as to the objects of this Bill. He begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

MR. BRODRICK: I hope the hon. Member will not persist in the Motion. I introduced the Bill under the Ten Minutes Rule, in order to explain the measure.

MR. CALDWELL: I could not hear your explanation when you made it.

MR. BRODRICK: That was not my fault. I explained the Bill, and a full report of what I said was given in the Press. The Bill is so simple that I can explain it in a few words, and I hope the hon. Member opposite will withdraw his Motion.

MR. DALZIEL: I think it will be better to dispose of my Motion first.

MR. BRODRICK: This is a Bill to carry out only what the House has already voted. Hon. Members have already before them my explanation of last year and the explanation which I gave again this year. A large sum of money was suggested, and it has been voted in the House when the whole question was fully discussed. This Bill tries to establish for the first time a real Militia Reserve, and there has never been one before.

MR. DALZIEL asked if it was in order, upon a Motion for the adjournment of the debate, to go into details of the Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: One of the hon. Member's grounds for moving the adjournment was that the Bill had now been explained. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman may be permitted briefly to show that he has already explained it.

MR. BRODRICK: The Motion of the hon. Member prevents me giving the explanation he asks for.

MR. DALZIEL: No, my Motion does not prevent the right hon. Gentleman making his explanation, but it will enable him to make it in a proper form.

MR. BRODRICK: The House has voted a Militia establishment of 150,000 men, but it has never reached more than 100,000. It is now proposed to utilise for home defence those soldiers who go back to civil life, and that men who have served fourteen years in the Army and Reserve shall become eligible for the Militia Reserve. They will only be liable to be called upon in case of a national emergency. In addition, it is proposed that men who have served ten years in the Militia shall become eligible for the Reserve. As regards the Yeomanry, in view of the great expense of providing a large increase in the Regular cavalry, it is proposed to form a special service section of the Yeomanry, and Yeomen who are willing to serve in that section will be offered £5 a year. Other Clauses in the Bill give the same conditions as obtain in the Militia—a principle which has already been accepted by the House. I do appeal to the House to allow us to take the necessary steps to carry out the provision which the House has already made. I have only one other remark to make. There is the strongest possible desire in some quarters to bring the country to a pass in which compulsion may be necessary for home defence, and nothing can render the country more free from the fear of compulsion than to bring the Militia up to its strength by voluntary enlistment. It cannot be satisfactory that this House should vote 150,000 men for home defence, and that we should never have more than 100,000. This number of men for home defence has been voted by both sides of the House for the last twenty or thirty years, but that establishment has never been reached, and therefore our home defence cannot be said to be efficient. I hope the House will allow us to take the Second Reading of the Bill now.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) thought this Bill, however uncontroversial it might be, contained elements which should lead the House to ponder before passing the measure through this stage at such a late hour. He was not inclined to give further powers, even for the training of the forces referred to in the Bill, until the House received some further satisfaction as to the treatment of both the Reservists and others of the rank and file under the Crown. His right hon. friend referred to the offer of £5 a year made to the Yeomanry under this Bill. What he wished to know was, would the Yeomanry have the same difficulty in getting the £5 which was offered as the Reserve forces had found in getting what was now due to them? He was not at all disposed to treat this proposal as one which would result in putting off the day when compulsion would be necessary, and he felt bound to join in the appeal made by hon. Members opposite to defer the consideration of this Bill, in order that they might know a little more as to how things were managed at the War Office, and how this Bill would be carried into effect. The explanation given by his right hon. friend was certainly very meagre, and it was introduced in a ten minutes speech under circumstances which precluded them hearing what the right hon. Gentleman said. The matter became one of great importance when they recognised that the word training must also mean the word pay, and the way in which the men of all ranks had recently been treated by the Department over which the right hon. Gentleman presided was a good reason for not giving further discretionary power to the War Office, which might result in inflicting further personal and unjust suffering upon a large number of men who came forward, on the faith of representations and pledges made by the War Office which were afterwards broken, and which led to a still more serious state of things, that of rendering the Army unpopular by the way the men were treated upon returning home.

*MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said that if the Bill were to pass as a non-contentious measure, Section 3 of Clause 1, referring to a special service section of the Yeomanry, ought to be omitted. The proposal which it embodied was most inadvisable. In regard to what the right hon. Gentleman had said about compulsory service, such a proposal would never be passed by the House of Commons except in a great national emergency. But if anything was likely to make compulsory service necessary it was a proposition such as that which was embodied in Clause 3. To hold up a certain part of the Volunteer forces as being alone fit for war would depress the interest taken by the others in the profession of arms. When the late war broke out he was placed in command of a force of Yeomanry, and without this provision which was now proposed every single one of them volunteered for active service. They could not get anything better than that even with the provision which was now suggested. He considered that Clause 3 contained a most unwise proposal, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw it.

Question put and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL said this measure had been introduced without any attempt to explain it. Such a measure ought to be accompanied upon its introduction by a clear statement. The handing over of an estate to the nation was not necessarily a beneficial purpose, and he desired to know the purposes to which the Osborne Estate was going to be applied. It might be intended to apply it to one particular section of the community. He also wished to know something about the cost which would be entailed. Obviously it was unreasonable that at this moment a Bill of this kind should be brought before the House. The best way to pass measures of this kind was to give a reasonable explanation of them, and take the House into the confidence of the Government. Whenever a measure was brought forward in the way he had suggested there was never any unwillingness to give it favourable consideration. The Bills which failed to pass were those which the Government attempted to rush through a few minutes before twelve o'clock——

It being midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 11*th November*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Galashiels (two); Selkirk; Biggleswade; Arlesey; Dover; Armadale; and, Bo'ness; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Millbrook; Ampthill; Morse; and, Week St. Mary; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Biggleswade; Arlesey; Dover; Armadale; and, Bo'ness; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Great Shefford; Southport; and, Birkdale; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Selkirk; Biggleswade; Arlesey; Armadale; and, Bo'ness; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th August; *Mr. Walter Palmer*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 369.]

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of the number of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Cape Guardafui Lighthouse.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will name the Powers with whom the Foreign Office have recently been in communication in regard to the proposed establishment of a lighthouse on Cape Guardafui.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) We have been in communication with the Italian Government, who exercise a protectorate over the country in which the cape is situated. The Italian Government are in principle favourable to the establishment of this lighthouse. The companies having lines passing through the Gulf of Aden are not agreed as to the advisability of the proposal, and no agreement has been arrived at as to terms.

Zanzibar—Case of Slave Girl Msichoke.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, if he has received the Report from His Majesty's Acting Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar as to the slave girl Msichoke who was handed back to her master by the British authorities; and if he is now in a position to give any further information on the subject.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The Report from the Acting British Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar respecting the slave girl Msichoke has been received. Papers on the subject will shortly be laid before Parliament.

Colonial Patent Laws.

MR. RIGG (Westmoreland, Appleby): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether he will grant a Return showing the official fees payable in respect of Letters Patent for inventions in each of His Majesty's Colonies and Dependencies in which such Letters Patent are issued, and at what times, and by what instalments (if any), such fees are payable.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The hon. Member will find the information he requires as regards the self-governing colonies on pages 140 and 141 of the Colonial Conference Blue-book recently presented to Parliament and numbered [Cd. 1299]. I shall be happy to grant a Return if the hon. Member will move for it.

Remount Officers—Status of Veterinary Officers.

MR. RIGG: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the veterinary officers who accompanied the remount officers abroad were all members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons; and, if not, can he state the number of veterinary officers who were thus employed, and how many of them were members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am informed that all were members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

Education Bill—Allocation of Undenominational Endowments.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether all income at present received by the managers of voluntary schools, including endowments, will under the Bill now before the House be paid to the local authority; if so, whether the local authority would be able to utilise any undenominational endowments in providing scholarships from primary to secondary schools; and if under the Bill such endowments are not to be paid to the local authority, whether he will introduce a Clause to that effect.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) No general answer can be given concerning the income now received by managers, as each case must depend on its own particular circumstances The question of endowments is already dealt with in the Government Clause now on the Paper.

Education Bill—Government Amendments.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, at what stage of the Education Bill and in what form he proposes to carry out the undertakings given that Amendments shall be made by the Government to insure that persons other than the local authority who propose to provide schools shall carry out without unreasonable delay their engagement, that regard shall be had to the grouping and co-ordination of all branches of education under the same Education Committee, and other similar undertakings which have not hitherto been carried out in Committee on the Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The undertakings into which the Government have entered will be fulfilled, in cases where statutory provision is necessary, by Amendments, or new Clauses to be proposed in Committee or on Report.

London Water Bill.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the remaining stages of the London Water Bill will be taken.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid I cannot fix the actual day for the resumption of the debate on this measure, but I propose to take the Bill after the Third Reading of the Education Bill in the course of the week beginning 1st December.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

The Mediterranean Fleet.

*LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will give the names of the following vessels forming the Mediterranean Fleet in June 1901; viz., battleships, cruisers, torpedo boat destroyers, and similarly the names of the vessels forming the Mediterranean Fleet at present date; also, if all stores and coal are now up to full requirements.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Since the date named in the Question, the following replacements and additions have taken place. Five battleships, "Royal Oak," "Royal Sovereign," "Empress of India," "Devastation," and "Hood" have been replaced by seven battleships, viz., "Bulwark," "Implacable," "Irresistible," "Formidable," "London," "Vengeance," and "Repulse." Two cruisers, "Theseus" and "Barham," have been replaced by five cruisers, viz., "Aboukir," "Hermione," "Pegasus," "Pandora," and "Intrepid." The number of torpedo boat destroyers has been raised from sixteen to twenty-eight. The stores of coal were up to requirements at the date named, and are in the same condition now. Owing, however, to the large addition to the Fleet, the requirements have naturally increased, and the total amount of stores and coal is larger than at the earlier date.

Royal Navy—Pensions of Chief Petty Officers.

*LORD CHARLES BERESFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the question of the increase to the pension of the chief petty officers of the Royal Navy is still under the consideration of the Admiralty; and, seeing that the chief petty officers have repeatedly submitted their claims through their commanding officers since the year 1878, can he inform the House as to the decision the Admiralty have arrived at on this question affecting the lower deck of His Majesty's fleet.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The question is one of some difficulty and complication. At the present time the Admiralty are considering it afresh as part of a larger scheme.

Mr. Chamberlain's Tour—The "Good Hope."

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of the Admiralty whether, as the "Good Hope" is a cruiser presented to the British Navy by the Cape Colony, he will consider the advisability of arranging that she should first touch South African soil at the capital of the Colony responsible for this contribution to our Navy.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The route of the "Good Hope" has been arranged to meet the wishes of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and it is not proposed to make any alteration. The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension with regard to the contribution made by the Cape Colony to the Navy. Since 1899, the Colony has paid a sum of £30,000 annually to the Imperial Exchequer, and the spirit which has prompted this grant is greatly appreciated by the Government. The first cost of the "Good Hope," however, amounted to over a million, and the annual cost of maintenance exclusive of repairs, is estimated at about £100,000. It will be seen, therefore, that it is hardly correct to say that the cruiser was presented to the British Navy by the Colony. I may add that the Colony of Natal has also for some years past made a contribution to Naval Funds which, in relation to the population of the Colony, is no less generous than that made by the Cape.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead); May I ask whether the Admiralty are afraid to steam this vessel direct to the Cape, instead of from port to port, from Gibraltar to Malta and from Malta to Port Said?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am quite unaware how that arises out of this Question.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: She is fitted with Belleville boilers.

Sales of Army Horses in South Africa.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any animals suffering from infectious disease have been sold by the military authorities in South Africa; if so, whether that practice will be discontinued.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have no knowledge of the alleged sales.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the noble Lord inquire?

LORD STANLEY: I not think such a thing could have occurred. All complaints of this kind would in the ordinary course be referred to a Departmental Committee of which I am a member, and none has reached us.

South African Repatriation Boards—Purchasers from the Military Authorities

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, what has been the price paid by the Repatriation Board in South Africa to the military authorities for horses, mules, oxen, and waggons respectively.

LORD STANLEY: After much discussion between the Departments a lump sum was agreed upon, and we can only divide this arbitrarily among the different articles. It has accordingly been settled that the following prices may be accepted as correct. For brood mares £25, £20 and £12 each, according to height; for geldings, £15 each; for mules, £27 each; for oxen in poor condition £10 each; for ox-waggons with teams of 16 oxen £200 each, and for mule waggons £30 each.

Reservists' Pay Arrears.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that Private Albert Finson, 20th Hussars (Depôt, Hounslow), returned to this country from South Africa more than two months ago, and, all his papers being in order, after communicating with his commanding officer to obtain the pay due to him, succeeded in seeing the Permanent Under Secretary of State for War on the 30th ultimo, and received £14 out of the £28 due to him the following day; and whether he will state why the pay due to this man has been withheld, in contravention of the Army Orders, which provide that only one week should intervene between the first and final settlement of pay due to reservists and time expired men on their return from the war.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Privates Wright, Denton, Andrews, and Haughton, 4th Hussars, now attached to the regimental depôt at Hounslow, reached England by the "Hawarden Castle" on 13th September on their return from the war; whether these men received £5 of pay due to them on 14th September, 1902, and £3 on 20th October, 1902, while the pay due to them is about £25; and, seeing that these men have discharge certificates and their parchment characters, will he say why the settlement of pay due to them was not made on 21st September 1902, in accordance with Army Order, September 1902, which lays down that one week should intervene between the first and final settlement of all pay due to them; and whether all the papers and officers necessary to secure the prompt payment reached the United Kingdom at the same time as these men.

LORD STANLEY: The men referred to in these two Questions have now been settled with. The cause of the delay is being made the subject of further inquiry.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Is it not the fact that immediately after these Questions appeared on the Paper these men were paid and no questions were asked about their papers?

LORD STANLEY: I only know that one man was paid a fortnight ago.

Army Staff Appointments.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state on what grounds it has been decided that every command and staff appointment of an ordinary character shall be for a period of three years only.

LORD STANLEY: The tenure of staff appointments was reduced from five years to three, with the view of keeping officers more in touch with their units, and to curtail lengthened periods of absence on the staff. Power was retained, however, to extend an officer's tenure to complete five years in case it should seem desirable in the interests of the public service.

MR. TULLY: Will the noble Lord consider the advisability of giving a command to General de Wet?

Army Mobilisation.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the Government to keep a force mobilised and ready for embarkation; and if so, whether he will state its number and composition.

LORD STANLEY: The reply to my hon. friend is in the negative. If he will consider the necessary uncertainty of the country in which the force may have to operate, and the corresponding variations in its composition, equipment, clothing and transport, he will understand that his suggestion, to be made effective would have to be carried out on a very large and varied scale.

MR. YERBURGH: Are we to understand from that reply that it is not intended to keep any force of any size whatsoever ready for embarkation without having to mobilise ?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. My hon. friend must not understand that from my answer.

British Residents at Jerusalem.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottinghamshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to a petition of grievances sent, in or about the month of January, 1901, to the Foreign Office by British subjects resident in Jerusalem, complaining of their treatment by His Majesty's Consulate in that city; and will he say whether an inquiry was held.

I beg also to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that a petition of British residents in Jerusalem complaining of their treatment by his Majesty's Consulate in Jerusalem was sent by the Foreign Office to his Majesty's Consul at Jerusalem; and that, thereupon, the Arab dragoman and clerk proceeded to intimidate the signatories; and, seeing that the grievances of British subjects at Jerusalem have gone unredressed up to the present, and that dissatisfaction with the way in which the consulate is carried on still prevails, will he make inquiries into this case.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): he answer to the first sentence is in the affirmative. Inquiries have already been made into the allegations, which have not been substantiated, but further inquiries will be made through His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople.

*MR. YOXALL: Were the inquiries made by the persons accused ?

LORD CRANBORNE: They were made by the Foreign Office.

Uganda Railway.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the advances from the Consolidated Fund under the Uganda Railway Acts have exhausted the statutory provision made; and whether he will state what course it is intended to take with regard to financing the railway for the present.

LORD CRANBORNE: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. In regard to the second, I propose shortly to introduce a Bill into the House to provide the further funds necessary for the service of the railway.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY: This session ?

LORD CRANBORNE: Yes, Sir.

Supply of Army Horses.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire Spalding): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has issued the leaflet giving to farmers and horse breeders the particulars of the type of horses required by the War Office; and, if not, will he state when he proposes to do so.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The total number of horses required annually by the War Office will not, I am informed, be more than 2,500, of which, roughly, about 1,000 will be bought in Ireland and about 1,500 in Great Britain. That being so, I do not think that the question is of any great interest to the British farmer and horse-breeder.

Island of Lewis—Hospital Accommodation.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Lewis District Committee report that hospitals are urgently needed at Swanabost, Ness, and Leurbost Lochs, Island of Lewis, but that the requisite funds cannot be raised owing to the public health maximum rate of assessment of 1s. per £ having already been reached; and will he say whether he can see his way to render assistance in the matter.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): As the hon. Member is aware the Congested District Board is not empowered to make grants for such objects. The Secretary for Scotland has no funds at his disposal for these purposes.

MR. WEIR: But will the right hon. Gentleman make it his business to see that provision is made against this state of things?

[No answer was returned.]

Island of Lewis Fisheries.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the attention of the Secretary for Scotland has been called to a petition to the King signed by over 2,000 crofters, cottars, fishermen, and others of the Island of Lewis, urging amongst other matters that a fast steaming gunboat should be stationed off the Island of Lewis for the purpose of protecting the interests of the line fishermen against trawlers within the three miles limit; and will the Secretary for Scotland endeavour to meet the desire of the petitioners.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: No intimation of such a petition has as yet reached the Secretary for Scotland.

Volunteers and Richmond Park.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Hunts, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether the Government have decided to set apart increased areas of Richmond Park for Volunteer drill and manœuvres.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The First Commissioner is permitted by the Ranger to say that he will favourably consider applications made by the Volunteers for permission to drill over extended areas of Richmond Park, provided that the nature of the manœuvres is not such as to interfere unduly with the enjoyment of the Park by the public. Commanding officers of Volunteer battalions desiring to exercise their men in Richmond Park, must make their applications through the General Commanding the Home District.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Should application be made at once by Volunteers?

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: Yes, I believe so.

Palace Yard Lighting Arrangements.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (North Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Hunts, as representing the First Commisioner of Works, whether his attention has been drawn to the inferior quality of the gas and the imperfect lighting of New Palace Yard and the other immediate precincts of the Houses of Parliament; and whether this can be improved.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: The question of lighting of the New Palace Yard and the precincts of the Houses of Parliament is engaging the attention of the First Commissioner, and it is hoped that an improvement may be effected.

Ireland—North-West Assize Circuit.

THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON (Londonderry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the public inconvenience and expense caused by holding the Winter Assizes for the north-west counties in Belfast, arrangements can be made for holding a separate Winter Assize for the north-west counties in Londonderry or some other suitable town in the North-West Circuit.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this Question. The existing arrangements, under which Winter Assizes are each year held in one town in each of the four provinces of Ireland has, on the whole, worked well and given general satisfaction. Any public inconvenience or expense resulting from it would, I apprehend, be increased rather than diminished by splitting up the several provinces into two or more Winter Assize Counties, while the interests of the administration of justice would undoubtedly suffer. The number of prisoners from the north-west counties of Ulster tried at the last Winter Assizes at Belfast was sixteen, which was about the average—a number scarcely sufficient to require a separate Winter Assizes to deal with. I would also point out to my noble friend that as Derry city is the only county borough in those north-west counties, unless the Winter Assizes were held there permanently, a most objectionable course in such a circumscribed venue, it would be necessary at intervals much more frequent than at present, to inflict on the jurors of the north-west counties at large the great inconvenience of assembling in mid-winter in some of the county towns to dispose of the business. As the convenience of jurors is, next to the administration of justice, the most important matter to be considered, I don't think any change should be made until the general body of the jurors of the north-west counties have had an opportunity of considering it.

THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON: Have you consulted the High Court judges on this matter?

MR. ATKINSON: I do not think it is a matter for them. It is rather one for the Executive.

Lough Gara Eel Fishery.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he has received a complaint from the proprietor of an eel fisherery at Lough Gara, near Boyle, as to his having suffered a loss of £60 during the last two years owing to the floods caused by the drainage operations carried out by the Congested Districts Board on the Dillon estate; and whether he can state what compensation the Board intend to award him for the loss he has sustained.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Congested Districts Board made inquiry into the matter of this complaint and were satisfied that the drainage operations had not had the effect stated. The Board therefore declined to pay compensation.

MR. TULLY: Cannot this man be afforded an opportunity of giving evidence at the investigation?

MR. WYNDHAM: The investigation has been made.

Tramways (Ireland) Acts.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Government will circulate amongst Members the Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on The Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1902; and whether the Government intend in the coming Session to codify and amend the Tramways (Ireland) Acts, 1860 to 1900.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Report to which the hon. Member apparently refers is an inter-Departmental Report which it would be contrary to the invariable practice to publish. I cannot give an undertaking in respect of next session.

Examinations for Irish Local Governmen Auditors.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the standard of examination for temporary auditors under the Irish Local Government Board has been raised during the past two years; whether all candidates who fail at one examination get a second nomination for a subsequent examination; and, if not, will he state what rule or standard guides the Local Government Board in deciding who are to get a second nomination and examination.

MR. WYNDHAM: The standard of examination has not been raised during the past two years, so far as I am aware. The selection of fitting persons to receive nominations is considered *de novo* when occasion arises for a new examination. There is no presumption in favour of giving a nomination to a candidate who has failed, to the prejudice of others who have never had a chance of qualifying. On the other hand, failure does not necessarily constitute disqualification.

Carrick-on-Shannon Gaol.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what terms the Prisons Board would be prepared to hand over the disused prison at Carrick-on-Shannon to the Leitrim Agricultural and Technical Committee for the purpose of carrying out a remunerative local industry in the district.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Prisons Board, subject to the consent of the Treasury, is prepared to hand over this prison to the County Council, provided that the Council supplies suitable accommodation for prisoners awaiting trial. The Board is already in communication with the county authority in the matter.

Longford and Leitrim Fair Rent Applications.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of applications to fix fair rents at present pending in the counties of Longford and Leitrim for the first and second term rents; and when the next sub-Commission Courts will be held in these counties.

MR. WYNDHAM: Twenty-two and 185 in Longford, and fifty-two and 186 in Leitrim. A sub-Commission will sit at Manorhamilton, Co. Leitrim, on the 11th and 12th instant. No date has yet been fixed for the next sitting of a sub-Commission in Longford; but a list of pending cases from that county is in preparation and will shortly be published.

Irish Dispensary Medical Service.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the county Waterford the medical men have combined not to accept any position as dispensary medical officer at a less salary than £200 per year; and whether, in view of the inconvenience that has recently arisen at elections of doctors in that county, will he state what steps the Government propose to take to ameliorate the position of dispensary medical officers in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: It appears that a resolution to the effect indicated in the first part of the Question was passed by the Waterford Medical Association in September. In reply to the second inquiry, I do not think I can usefully add to my reply to the similar Question put to me by the hon. Member on Thursday last. †

MR. TULLY: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman take steps to raise the salaries of these people to something higher than the wages of mechanics?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is a matter which cannot be dealt with by way of Question and Answer. There are many points to be considered, including the burden on the poor ratepayers.

Local Government (Ireland) Act.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when it is proposed to proceed with the Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already referred to a statement made by the Prime Minister in this matter. The hon. Member must see that it is impossible to interrupt the proceedings on the Committee stage of the Education Bill.

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman be prepared to go on with this Bill after the guillotine has fallen on the Education Bill?

[No answer was returned.]

The Brussels Convention.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the House will have an opportunity of considering the Brussels Convention on the Sugar Bounties question..

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend, I have to repeat the statement of policy which I have already made. I hope to take the discussion on the Sugar Convention on Monday, the 24th inst.

---

† See page 275.

London Street Traffic—Proposed Royal Commission.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the increasing congestion of traffic in the streets of London, and to the need for more rapid modes of transit between distant parts, His Majesty's Government will consider the desirability of instituting an inquiry, by Royal Commission or otherwise, into the means of locomotion and transportation in London on and beneath the surface, including the better regulation of vehicular traffic, the possibility of appropriating certain thoroughfares to certain kinds of traffic, the means of facilitating the construction of electric tramways along, or immediately beneath, the streets, and the steps to be taken for creating a properly arranged and conveniently inter-connected system of deep-level electric railways. In putting this Question, may I explain that it is not intended by it to suggest that such an inquiry should in any way supersede any ordinary inquiries before Committees of the House specially appointed to consider the question of particular Bills. It is meant to lay down the outlines of a scheme, and especially to consider the question of deep-level railways.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that the subject to which the right hon. Gentleman refers is one of the first importance, not merely for the metropolis, but for the country at large. The only hesitation I have in giving an affirmative reply to the interrogatory on the Paper is lest a Royal Commission should have the effect of unduly delaying necessary steps, but I will consider the matter, and I think, in all probability, a Royal Commission would be the best course.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman take care that the terms of reference to any Royal Commission will provide for a very important matter not mentioned at all in the Question—namely, how the capital for these ideal schemes is to be obtained?

[No answer was returned.]

The Cunard Agreement.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the agreement with the Cunard Company will be placed upon the Table; and when the House will have an opportunity of considering its terms and policy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not yet in a position to say when the agreement with the Cunard Company will be ready for presentation. It involves a great many details, and the necessary alterations in the Company's articles of association would require the sanction of the shareholders before the agreement is finally approved.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Does that answer apply to the agreement with the Atlantic Steam Trust, or can that be laid at an earlier date?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure that it would be expedient to lay one without the other. They are very closely bound together.

The Indian Budget.

MR. WEIR: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when an opportunity will be given to resume the debate on the Indian Budget?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should be sorry to prophesy on that subject.

Tunbridge Wells Telephone System.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I wish to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to a secret agreement prepared by the National Telephone Company with regard to the purchase of the municipal telephone system of Tunbridge Wells, which has been approved by the Town Clerk without the consent or knowledge of the Council of Tunbridge Wells or of the ratepayers, and which may be ratified tomorrow with the Postmaster General's consent; and whether, in view of the extraordinary circumstances under which the agreement was procured, he will undertake to notify to the Council that he will withhold his consent to the proposed transfer.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): No application has yet been made to me by the Corporation of Tunbridge Wells on this subject. Until such an application is made, and until I am in possession of the Council's reasons for making it, I do not propose to express any opinion on the subject.

MR. LOUGH: I wish now to ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House to call the attention of the House to the subject as a definite matter of urgent public importance, seeing that the right hon. Gentleman declines to say that he will withhold his consent.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think I can accept the Motion. There appears to be at present a dispute between the Town Council and the Town Clerk, about a contract with the Company, and it is not a matter of public administration at all. As soon as the application is brought before the Post Office they will have to inquire into these matters. At present the question is only as I have described it.

MR. LOUGH: May I point out with very great respect that this is a very urgent matter. It is entirely unprecedented in the history of municipalities in this country. The transfer will be completed tomorrow if no action is taken.

*MR. SPEAKER: There has been nothing completed or done as far as any public department is concerned. An arrangement, the hon. Member says, has been made between a Company and a Corporation without the authority of the Corporation. The Town Clerk has no authority to bind the Corporation.

MR. LOUGH: There are other steps to be taken.

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept the Motion for Adjournment.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): In view of the Motion shortly to be put for the suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule, may I ask the Prime Minister how late he proposes to ask the House to sit, if the Closure Resolution is not disposed of at a reasonable hour.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I trust the House will come to a decision on this question at a reasonable hour, as has been done on previous occasions.

A QUESTION OF ORDER.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I wish to put to you, Sir, a question on a point of order. If, on the Amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, you put the Motion that all words after "That" stand part of the Question, it will preclude the discussion of the other Amendments dealing with details, and I beg, therefore, to ask whether you will so put the Amendment of the Leader of the Opposition to the Motion of the Leader of the House, to be moved later on, as not to exclude other Amendments on points of detail of which notice has also been given. There are two exact precedents for putting it in that way.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman told me just now that he proposed to ask this Question, but I think I can answer what my course should be. Ordinarily speaking, Amendments are not reserved on a Resolution about the business of the House. On the first occasion on which a Resolution of this kind was proposed, that is on the Crimes Act of 1887, a debate, or rather a conversation, took place on the question respecting whether Amendments as to details could be reserved. On the first Amendment of the Resolution proposing to leave out all the words after "That," the question arose whether other Amendments should be reserved, and, after considerable conversation, Mr Speaker Peel determined to put the Question so as to reserve those Amendments. That course was followed, also, on the Home Rule Bill, and the only other occasion which arose was on the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, 1894. I think I am right in saying that there were there a number of Amendments as to details, but no general Amendment. Following those precedents, and without making any precedent as to ordinary Resolutions, not of this very exceptional character, I shall follow the same course, and reserve these Amendments.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Austin Taylor, esquire, for the borough of Liverpoool (East Toxteth Division).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER).

(2.43.) Motion made, and Question put, "That the consideration of business relating to the Education (England and Wales) Bill (Procedure) if under discussion at twelve o'clock this night be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 268 ; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 495.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortesque
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Lamoton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hon William Edw. H
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn, W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Penn, John

Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, HonM. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Priestley, Arthur
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (PROCEDURE).

(2.55.) THE PRIME MINISTER AND HE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No Leader of the House can rise in his place and propose a Resolution on the lines of that which I have put down upon the Paper with any feeling of satisfaction. I believe it to be a necessity. I think before I sit down I shall be able to convince the House that it is a necessity; but I frankly admit that to me, at all events, it is a most unpleasant necessity. It amounts to an admission that our ordinary procedure is insufficient to carry on the business of the House. It amounts to an admission that our

Rules—great as are the changes effected in those Rules since closure was first proposed by Mr. Gladstone twenty years ago—that our Rules, with all those changes, are not sufficient to enable this House to deal with the legislative work which is put before it. That would be an insignificant and unimportant admission if the legislative work put before it by the Government in the course of the present session were in any way excessive in amount, but, whatever may be thought of the merits of the Bills that we have brought to the notice of the House, whatever may be thought in particular of the Bill to which special reference is made in this Resolution, I think every candid critic will admit that we have in this session thrown no undue or excessive legislative burden upon the Members of this House. And if that be so, as I think it is, it must be a matter of great regret to all interested in our Parliamentary procedure that the House is incapable of dealing with even that modest burden without some such exceptional procedure as that which I am about to suggest. Now, Sir, I do not propose to deal at any length with many of the subsidiary, though important, arguments which, I have no doubt, will figure largely in the debate which is to succeed. As regards precedent, it is not perhaps necessary to do more than remind the House of what you, Mr. Speaker, have already reminded us this afternoon—that for Closure Resolutions of this character there are three precedents. There is the precedent of the Crimes Act of 1887, there is the precedent of the Home Rule Bill of 1893, and there is the precedent of the Evicted Tenants Act of 1894.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): And the Special Commission.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am reminded by the right hon. Gentleman that there is a fourth precedent—namely, that relating to the Parnell Commission. I should hardly have thought that that was on all fours, although I have not refreshed my memory with the details; but I will ask the House, if they wish to decide the question by precedent, to confine their attention to the three cases which Mr. Speaker has already mentioned. I may remind the House that closure by compartments was moved in the case of the Crimes Act when that Bill had been in Committee for fifteen days. It was moved in the case of the Home Rule Bill of 1893 when that Bill had been in Committee twenty-eight days. In the case of the Evicted Tenants Bill, it was moved when that Bill had been in Committee two days. I have now the painful task of moving the closure in regard to the Education Bill when that measure has been in Committee, not fifteen days, not twenty-eight days, and not two days, but no less than thirty-eight days. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Not full days."] I have not worked out the hours in each case; I am taking the rough estimate, and I think it will be found not far from the truth. So much for the bare precedents which we have to guide us.

Then, Sir, I come to an argument which, I think, is perhaps less relevant to the issue than the question of precedents, but which is not without its importance; and that is, the number of the minority who have throughout these prolonged debates on the Education Bill been criticising and resisting the proposals of the Government. In the cases of the Crimes Act, the Home Rule Bill, and the Evicted Tenants Bill, at all events, it was a great contest between the two parties in the House—the Government of the day and the Opposition of the day; and I may remind the House that the Opposition of the day were far more near to equality with the Government of the day than are the Opposition at present. But the opposition to this Bill is not conducted by the Opposition as a whole. I have had a calculation made, and I find that of the persons voting in the various divisions on this Bill the average against the Government amounted to 29 per cent., or less than one-third, of those present. Every one who has followed the discussions on this Bill knows that, though the Opposition has been vigorous and effective, still it has not represented the great body of opinion on the other side of the House. [Cries of "Oh," and an HON. MEMBER: What about the Irish Members?] The figures which I have read out are enough to prove it. But, though I think it desirable to bring that fact before the attention of the House, do not let it be supposed that I wish to dwell on it. I am perfectly ready to admit that the minority, although small, is a very important one, and that it contains within its ranks a great body of the best English Opposition opinion. I do not wish to undervalue its strength, vigour, or ability; though its numbers do not compare with the numbers of the Opposition who fought the three Bills to which reference has already been made.

The next argument, which I mean to mention for the purpose of not dwelling upon it, is the argument based upon obstruction. I do not mean to dwell upon that, because my main contention is wholly irrespective of the merits or demerits of the persons who have been conducting the Opposition. If I were to say that Gentlemen opposite had been obstructing the Bill, it would mean that I intended to pass some severe censure on their Parliamentary conduct, and that is wholly irrelevant to my case. In point of view of temper and mutual courtesy, I think the Opposition have very greatly distinguished themselves. Considering the feelings which, if not aroused, have, at all events, been expressed outside the walls of this House, the moderation of tone which has habitually characterised our debates is extremely creditable to the House of Commons. Then, I might dwell upon the fact that this Bill is only a Bill of twenty clauses; and of those clauses I do not believe that there are more than four or five that can be described as controversial. [Cries of "Oh."] I take as an indication of what is a controversial Clause the Amendment on the Paper in the name of the Leader of the Opposition, and I venture to say that, if four or five Clauses were eliminated from the Bill, it would be found that the other Clauses would not have provoked any prolonged discussion at all, and that we might very readily, and without any great expenditure of Parliamentary time, have passed the Bill so emasculated into law. Therefore, though other Clauses have been discussed, it is really four or five that are controversial. If that is so, does it not throw a very strong light upon the Parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves? After thirty-eight days in Committee, we still find ourselves a considerable distance from the end of the Committee stage of the Bill, and with the whole of the Report stage of the Bill before us, on which every Amendment would be in order which we have discussed in Committee.

Sir, these arguments, which I have briefly touched upon, are all relevant and all important; but they are not the arguments on which I wish mainly to rely in asking the House to decide in favour of this Resolution. If I could not give other and stronger reasons for this Motion, I am not sure that these reasons would not be sufficient. If the argument which I am about to give be sufficient, then these other arguments, however important, may be regarded as to a certain extent superfluous. I endeavour honestly to look at this question quite apart from the particular controversy on which we are engaged. I remember dealing with the Rules over which we spent a considerable portion of our time earlier in the Session; and I remember that I advised the Opposition in their criticisms never to forget that they might some day be sitting on the right hand of the Speaker; and I advised those who supported the Government never to forget that the time would come when they would be sitting on the left of the Speaker; and it was only by every man putting himself in that imaginative position that he could give a fair verdict on the question. That advice I beg to repeat, and even to put in a stronger form. I would ask Members of the House to withdraw themselves in imagination from any special view of the merits or demerits of this Bill, and as to the convenience or inconvenience to which they themselves are personally put, and to say whether it is not absolutely necessary, after a Bill has been debated at the length which has characterised our debates on this Bill, that some step of the kind I am proposing should be taken. We must, as Members of Parliament, whether we be Conservatives or Radicals, admit that Parliament cannot allow itself to be rendered absolutely ineffectual and impotent merely by the expenditure of time in discussion. The only question we have to ask ourselves is—what is the best method of giving to ourselves, or restoring to ourselves, that efficiency which is absolutely necessary if this is to be not merely a Chamber for discussion, but a Chamber also for legislation? I have given, I need hardly say, a great deal of thought to the various problems which have come to a head in this Resolution. These problems have occupied my thoughts—as I doubt not they have occupied the thoughts of all Members interested in Parliamentary procedure—not merely during the recent months, but for many years past. What are the possible remedies which can be suggested for the position of ineffectual impotence which I have just described? My right hon. friend the Member for the Sleaford Division, who is to speak tonight, has always had a strong personal leaning towards what he calls personal closure. He seems to think that the House of Commons can deal with this species of congestion by taking each offender in turn, and dealing summarily with him; and so by this process of expurgation gradually reducing our debates within reasonable limits. I know he holds that view with great earnestness; but I do not believe that it is practicable; and I am certain that, if my right hon. friend had watched this education debate as I have watched it, even he would come to the conclusion that it was impracticable. There has been no personal abuse of the rights of debate to be taken notice of by the House. I remember the right hon. Gentleman opposite, the Member for West Monmouthshire, saying, at an earlier stage of these debates, that they had been conducted on what he called "the Report principle"—that is to say, that hardly any Member had taken advantage of the right which we all possses in Committee of speaking more than once. Broadly speaking, that is a perfectly accurate statement. I do not say that no speeches were delivered which I thought irrelevant, or that no Amendments were moved which I thought unnecessary. But the idea that you could have remedied this particular disease by any form of personal closure would never suggest itself to any person who had watched these debates.

I put that remedy aside. The second remedy is whether we should use the powers of the closure which the standing orders give us in such a manner that debate may be hurried on, that trifling and irrelevant Amendments may be excluded, and the general progress of the discussion may be so accelerated that exceptional and drastic measures may become unnecessary. I have always maintained that our closure rules under the Standing Orders are most effectual, and work excellently, for First, Second, and Third Readings or Resolutions, but that they are utterly ineffectual to deal with anything like the Committee or the Report stages of a Bill, in which it is open to the ingenuity of any hon. Member to find some alternative proposal to that of the Government, or to suggest some modification of the proposal of the Government. That cannot be dealt with effectually, I fear—I have always held so—under our existing closure rules. It will be admitted that I have done my very best to use those rules so as to enable the House within reasonable compass to deal with the controversies raised by this measure, and what has been the result? I have not succeeded in my effort. The only Parliamentary result I know is that the hon. Member who cheered ironically a moment ago has given notice of an Amendment, which he has placed on the Paper, which seems to me to contain a not obscure attack on the Chair, and certainly indicated that, in his opinion, even the modest and moderate efforts which I have made to expedite business were to be branded and characterised as an interference with the rights of free discussion.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): If this Motion on my part was meant as an attack on the Chair, it certainly would have been put in the plainest possible terms.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I confess I thought the terms were perfectly plain. I saw no ambiguity about them. I therefore ask those who say that our existing methods of expediting business are sufficient, to cast their eyes back on the experience of the last month, and I think they will come to the conclusion that I have come to, that these rules are, for the Committee stage of a Bill, quite ineffectual and insufficient in the case of a measure fought as this measure has been fought.

What is the next remedy which the ingenuity of man can suggest? The next remedy is that of all-night sittings. I do not deny that all-night sittings, or a series of all-night sittings, may be a necessary, though certainly most unhappy form of expediting Parliamentary business. Let no one pretend, however, when they are praising all-night sittings as a mode of expediting

Parliamentary business, that it either promotes the dignity of the House or increases the freedom of debate. It does, in reality, neither one nor the other. What it does do is that it enables us, under our existing rules, and without some exceptional modifications such as I am now proposing, to force through in the teeth of a reluctant minority some particular stage or particular clauses of a measure. But the objections to it are quite obvious. The strain put on Members is very great; the strain put on the officers of the House is even greater. To pretend for a moment that discussions carried on under that particular species of pressure are equivalent to the free debate of this House at reasonable and seasonable hours is, of course, an extravagant proposition which no one would defend. In this case it would be wholly ineffectual. It might be possible—I doubt it—to finish by this method of a series of all-night sittings, by the application of physical torture in the form of want of sleep, the remaining Clauses in the Committee stage of this Bill, for these Clauses are of a kind which do not excite much heat or passion. But when you have done that you have the Report stage, and on the Report stage every Amendment raised on the Committee stage can be repeated; and I believe it is neither physically possible nor morally desirable to attempt such a terrific process of forcible debate, as to carry all the remaining stages by requiring Gentlemen who oppose and support the Government to sit up all night in an endeavour to make progress—to sit all night, night after night, in order to expedite business. I reject, therefore, all these measures. There are two others, and only two, which occur to me as possible. One is, that we might carry on this session to an indefinite period, to January, February, or March, and to continue all through these weary months the discussion on the Education Bill. I do not know that any one is going to propose that as a proper method of dealing with the situation. I have given it a great deal of thought, and so great is my aversion to any form of closure by compartments that I abandon it, I frankly admit, with the utmost reluctance. A plan of that sort disorganises the whole Parliamentary chronology. I do not know whether it would bring us into conflict with the law as to the annual Estimates or Supplies, but I am sure it is fraught with great inconvenience, for it absolutely destroys the rights of private Members so long as it lasts. In addition to that, it utterly disorganises the work of the succeeding session. Therefore, for these and other reasons with which I need not trouble the House, and on the whole, though not without hesitation and reluctance, I find myself forced to abandon the idea of recommending that course to the House. There remains only one other plan, and that is the plan known as "carrying over." I have always had a weakness for that plan. I am quite aware that I stand almost alone in that. [An HON. MEMBER: "No, no, many of us would agree."] I remember a Committee of which I was, if not the chairman, at least the labouring oar on behalf of the Government, and I drew up a Report. We had a long fight over that Report. In it I recommended a plan for carrying over, and I contrived to carry that Report by a bare Party majority. In every division there were against me the right hon. member for West Monmouth, Mr. Gladstone, and, I think, the right hon. Member for the Montrose Burghs; at all events the whole strength of the Opposition on a very strong Parliamentary Committee was against me; and whenever I have further suggested this plan of carrying over to my own friends on this side of the House it has been received with cold disapproval—that phrase would be too mild. I have therefore come to the conclusion that, whether it would be a good plan or a bad plan, it is not a plan which is ever likely to receive favour from any body of the House, or to become embodied as part of our ordinary machinery in the Standing Orders. I confess there is one argument against the plan of carrying over which I did not realise at the period to which I am referring, but which has been borne in upon me by reflection and experience since, and it is this. I am not sure that the character of this House could really survive a discussion on the trumpery details—even the most important Bill has its trumpery details—of a Bill extending not merely week after week, but month after month, and extending to session after session.

I believe we should get so sick of the proceedings, and of ourselves, and the country would get so sick of us, that we should sink under general derision or personal weariness, and therefore, I have to admit that my own views have on this subject undergone some change. Even if I thought I could carry such a proposal, which I am convinced I could not, I should not, after the experience which I have described, press it with the same youthful enthusiasm which I once possessed.

I believe that I have now exhausted every conceivable plan by which the House would be enabled to do that which everybody must admit it must do—namely, to carry an important Bill in a session which has not been unduly crowded by other work. That is the minimum which the House allows itself to do. But if every other method by which that end can be attained is to be abandoned, we are driven back reluctantly, sorrowfully, but inevitably, on the plan which I now have to propose to the House. Before asking the House to agree with that proposition, I would ask whether we have been unreasonable, either in the length of time we have allowed this Bill to go on in Committee, or in the general distribution of the business of the Session. I will remind the House of a calculation which I laid before it when discussing the Rules, and in which I pointed out that so long as the House was determined to spend as much time as it habitually spends on the King's Speech, on Supply, and all other financial arrangements, upon private Members' time, even as curtailed by the new Rules, and upon the other business absolutely necessary for conducting the business of the country, it did not leave more than six weeks for new Government legislation—I exclude the Budget, of course—but in a normal session for ordinary legislation I think that too small. I think that the House ought to curtail its privileges of criticism in order to give more time to legislation, but I will not press that now. We shall have spent on the Committee stage alone of this Bill something like fifteen days more than those six weeks. Three weeks of Parliamentary time, more than all the time available for new legislation under the normal system, we will have actually spent before the Committee stage comes to an end, in discussing the Committee stage alone of a single measure. Surely this is exhibiting far more patience than the Conservative Government did over the Crimes Act in 1887, or the Home Rule Government did in the Home Rule Bill in 1893, and certainly not going near the headlong impatience of the right hon. Member for Montrose, who came down and moved closure by compartments after, I think, two days of Committee on the Evicted Tenants Bill Surely we, who have gone on already thirty-eight days, have shown ample and long-suffering patience before applying the painful, drastic, but effectual remedy I have proposed.

I hope, Sir, I have proved to the House that the Government had no alternative but to adopt the general policy which I have sketched out. But it may be asked, and I think it ought to be asked, whether this is the best machinery by which that general policy can be carried into effect. I frankly tell the House I do not think it is. I think there is something clumsy in closure by compartments. It is not an ideal form; but it is, however, the form consecrated, if I may use the word in such a connection, by past experience. If I had attempted to bring before the House any more elaborate scheme such as those which I have taken the trouble to compare, they would, I think, have had a right to ask for more time to consider it than I trust they will have on the present occasion, and I confess I am reluctantly compelled to the belief that what has been done hitherto, up to the present time, three times, and, after to-night's debate, will have been done four times, has not been done for the last time, and the House ought really to take into serious consideration, I think, some better machinery for dealing with a situation like the present. I therefore make no pretensions to perfection in the plan I have adopted. I can only say it is the plan adopted by my predecessors, and it is the plan which I would advise the House, all things considered, to employ for the present occasion. I asked hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House in a early part of my speech to imagine themselves in the place of Ministers sitting here, and then try and consider the position of the minority of this House. I am perfectly aware that there may be friends of mine who, agreeing with the Government in their general policy, and ardently supporting them, as they have, in the debates over this Bill, nevertheless cannot help feeling some misgiving lest the precedent which we are using may be used against us. Well, Sir, I do not think they need entertain that fear, by which I by no means suggest that, if a Home Rule Government, a Government composed of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, came into power, they would not employ closure by compartments, because I have very little doubt that under some circumstances they would, but I do not think their course would be rendered easier by the precedent we are setting tonight. But if they will promise not to employ closure by compartments until we have been thirty-eight days in Committee on some controversial measure, I think my hon. friends may be perfectly sure, in the first place, that the precedent will not be often used; and, in the second place, that, when used, it will be one which it will be practically impossible for the House of Commons, as a whole, to resist. We know by observation that they are perfectly prepared not to follow our precedent, but to follow their own, and the proceedings on the Evicted Tenants Bill will give a good deal of thought to those who fear that anything we may do tonight will facilitate the task which may fall upon our successors in office. Those Gentlemen have already shown how they are prepared to deal with a Bill after two nights in Committee, and if we are now showing to them and the country the kind of sacrifice which we in a majority are prepared to make of time and trouble in order to secure free debate for this House, the precedent we have set will not be one which will militate against ample discussion, but, on the contrary, will have precisely the opposite effect. I hope I have now shown the House, in no controversial spirit, without, I trust, raising any debates which are likely to excite passion, why it is that, as Leader of the House of Commons, responsible for the moment for the business of the House, I deem it necessary in the interests of the House that this Resolution should be passed. I do not base it on the merits of the Bill we are now discussing; I do not base it on the demerits of the Opposition; I base it on the broad fact that Parliament has to do its work. That argument seems to me amply sufficient, and that argument is the one on which I rely in asking the House to support us on the present occasion. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill (including Proceedings on the Financial Resolution relating thereto), shall, unless previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion at times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned:—

"(*a*) The Proceedings in Committee on the remaining part of Clause 12, and on Clause 13, on Wednesday 12th November; (*b*) The Proceedings on Clauses 14,15, 16 and 17, on Thursday 13th November; (*c*) The Proceedings on Clauses 18, 19 and 20, and on the Committee Stage of the Financial Resolution, on Friday, 14th November; (*d*) The Proceedings on Report of the Financial Resolution, and on the New Clause relating to the aid grant, on Monday, 17th November; (*e*) The Proceedings on the New Clauses relating to endowments, local authority's managers, and grouping, on Tuesday, 18th November; (*f*) The Proceedings on the New Clause relating to managers, and any other Government New Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other Proceedings necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion, on Thursday, 20th November; (*g*) The consideration of the Report shall be appointed for Tuesday, 25th November; and the Proceedings on Report on any New Clauses and on Amendments to Parts I. and II. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on that day; (*h*) The Proceedings on Report on Amendments to Part III. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on Thursday, 27th November; (*i*) The proceedings on the Report of the Bill shall be concluded on Friday, 28th November.

"At 11 p.m. on the said days, or, if the day is a Friday, at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business.

"In the case of new Clauses and Schedules, he shall put only the Question that such Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill.

"Proceedings under this Order shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

"After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Education (England and Wales) Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no Dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order 17, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith.

"If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

(3.42.) SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I fully recognise, as every one must, the amiable and even philosophic tone in which the right hon. Gentleman has moved this Resolution, but I rise to move an Amendment which invites the House to decline to give its approval of the course which he proposes we shall take. I am sure of one thing—that the sentiment he expressed on this subject is shared by us all. I am sure there is in no part of the House a single man who regards a summary and forcible procedure of this kind otherwise than with repugnance. On the other hand, I am equally sure that there is no one, or almost no one, who does not admit that there may be extreme, and urgent, and exceptional cases in which it may be necessary to use it. But before we are satisfied that any such course is not expedient only, but necessary (because it goes beyond expediency to the bounds of necessity) every Member ought to examine what is the nature—because it depends upon this—and I would even use another word, the texture—of the Bill before the House, what are the circumstances of its origin, what is the feeling regarding it, what is the urgency of its passing, what will be the evil consequences of its delay, and, above all, whether there has been leading up to this incident of the day anything in the nature of obstruction—that is to say, of a deliberate determination to thwart and impede the progress of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman gives the go-by to this question of obstruction, but the whole of this machinery, so far as it has been applied, has been applied solely for pure obstruction. It is in obstruction it had its origin, and that is the mischief for which it is the cure, and therefore it is the more necessary for the right hon. Gentleman, as he abandons obstruction, to prove his case on other grounds. I have said that we all admit there must be exceptions, but I find that there are two notable authorities in the House who do not admit any necessity for the Rule at all. There were two opinions expressed on the occasion so often referred to—that of the Home Rule Bill. One of these authorities said:

> "I do not come here to oppose this Resolution as a Unionist, but because I think it is absolutely inconsistent with the very elements of the life of a free debating assembly."

It was, therefore, not because the Home Rule Bill was in itself so abominable, not because it was so dangerous to the Empire, or on any ground of that sort; it was apart altogether from the merits of the Bill that he opposed the Resolution as being inconsistent with the very elements of the life of a free debating assembly.

> "We are going," said this authority "to set up a precedent which for all time will impair the efficiency and cloud the honour of this assembly," and he went on to describe the Resolution as "the wreck of the liberties of Parliament.'

This was quite apart from, and irrespective of, any particular circumstances of the merits or demerits of the Bill to which the procedure was to be applied. The other high authority said:—

> "We are on a declining plane. The Government for very shame proposes to give us a month. The next Government will perhaps give us a week only."

A prediction which has been most accurately fulfilled.

> "Be sure of this,"

the authority went on—

> "the tendency is constantly to diminish. You are on a fatal incline. I would say that a

Bill of this kind ought in no case, under no circumstances, under no stress, in no extremity, to be subjected to any curtailment of free debate."

Those were the opinions of the present First Lord of the Treasury and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. And now the First Lord comes forward with a proposal identical with the one to which he then objected. I leave to him the task of reconciling his proceeding now with the opinions he then expressed.

For my part, I take a much more moderate and reasonable view. We must contemplate that there may be cases of extreme urgency which demand this somewhat violent interference with the rights of minorities. But what is the case today? The right hon. Gentleman has given up the case so far as it is founded on obstruction, as well he may. The only obstruction I have observed was of a most casual, accidental, and genial kind. It proceeded from the benches opposite. On more than one occasion there appeared to be a little difficulty in marshalling the forces of the Government, and hon. Members opposite continued to debate on some small point, having a difficulty in adapting their countenances to the seriousness of the matter before the House; and they carried on the debate, if debate it could be called, until a member of the King's Household came in and told them in an audible voice that it was unnecessary to keep it up any longer. I make no objection whatever. On the contrary, they were doing, no doubt, a good public service. It must be so, because I observe that one of the hon. Members who took a leading part in that proceeding has promptly received a high honour from the Government.

What has happened on this Bill? On both sides of the House Amendments have been moved and accepted; and that reminds me to point out an extraordinary omission on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. He has said nothing of the nature of the Bill, or of its attendant circumstances. Now, we found our whole case upon the nature of the Bill, and we say that these numerous Amendments would not have been necessary if the Bill had not been introduced in such an elementary condition that it had to be patched and mended in order that it might hold together at all. Obstruction! Why I venture to say that never has a Party, regarding a measure as obnoxious, so single-mindedly done so much to improve it. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] The Colonial Secretary, as usual, laughs.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Not as usual.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Have none of those Amendments, the discussion of which was so tedious and inconvenient, been adopted by the Government? Compare the condition of the Bill now—up to and including Clause 12—with its original form, and you will find at once a complete justification of all that has happened, and an overwhelming confirmation of my contention. Go back to the Home Rule Bill. The Opposition of those days were exerting all their ingenuity to ruin that Bill. But on this occasion my hon. friends, who are, many of them, experts in education, who are thorough masters of the subject, who know it in its practical working, have been doing their best to improve your Bill and make it more workable. Amendment after Amendment has been introduced by the Government to meet the views expressed by my hon. friends, and without being so effusively and submissively grateful as the right hon. gentleman expected, we at least acknowledge the fact.

The right hon. gentleman says that Parliamentary institutions are on their trial. He made a speech in the City not long ago in which he said that these long debates were a discredit to the House of Commons, and that Parliament would not retain its position if they were allowed to continue. Now he speaks of Parliament being ineffective and impotent. And what is his cure for the ineffectiveness and impotence of Parliament? It is to suspend the privileges of the House of Commons; it is to institute government by executive degree; it is to take away the powers of Parliament. That is how he thinks he will increase the respect of the country for it. That is not the way at all. I think I shall be able by-and-bye to give some reasons that go far to account for the condition of things which exist. Last night, at a festive scene, the right hon. gentleman again pleasantly described our debates. It seems to be a favourite topic with the right hon. Gentleman. He says we have had a great deal of local government, a great deal of religion, but very little of education. If that is so, why is it? Local government? Yes, because this Bill transgresses some of the most elementary principles of local government, because it brought, as originally introduced, confusion of the powers and duties of local bodies, because it abolishes—I am sorry I have to speak in the present tense—efficient local bodies, and imposes on other local bodies new and strange functions which they do not ask for, and which, on one hand and the other, they are declining to undertake. This Bill, which is to affect local government, high and low, throughout the country, leaves definitions undefined and boundaries unmarked. That is why there has been so much of local government in the debates. Then why have you heard so much about religion? Because the main purpose of a great part of this Bill is not the improvement of education, but the establishment of denominational teaching—a purpose religious, not educational. One denomination is to be quartered on the rates for teaching purposes, and the atmosphere of one religious sect is to be created and maintained in schools which we are still to call national. That is why you have heard so much about religious questions, and why you will continue to hear so much, unless one thing is done. If the right hon. Gentleman disclaims that that is the object of the Bill, let him sweep the parts I have referred to out of the Bill, and I promise him that in proportion as he does so, he will hear less of religion.

Let us go back to the origin of this Bill, for in the case of a Bill so complicated, so thorny, so difficult, it is well to go back to its origin when it is intended to inflict this grievous blow on the privileges of Parliament on its account. Let us put aside the question of educational reform, and of the extension of higher education, especially of a scientific and technical kind. That is not a matter with which there is a "ha'porth" of difference in the country; everybody is agreed on that. If you had introduced a Bill dealing with that subject, it would have gone through rapidly, with only such discussion as was necessary to make it work well. Could not that have been done without dabbling with elementary education? If Parliament has been brought to anything in the nature of an *impasse*, we must ask those who led us into it why they did it. We must ask the Government why they took up the subject of elementary education. They themselves evidently did not see the necessity for interfering much or soon with elementary education. They introduced Bills in 1899, 1890, and even in 1901—after the Cockerton decision had lopped off the top branches of the School Board system; but these three Bills did not touch elementary education. If it is said to have been necessary on the ground of educational efficiency, I have taken the trouble to get the latest Report of the Board of Education, and I find this on the subject of general efficiency:—

> "The general efficiency of public elementary schools throughout the country is maintained at a high level, and while there is still room for improvement in many schools, very few wholly fail to provide adequate instruction for the children attending them. During the year only one school had the grant withheld on a second report of inefficiency under the conditions of Article 86 of the Code;" and so on.

Do not let it be imagined that this is the optimistic view of some self-satisfied clerk in a public Department, who never sees anything beyond the walls of his office; this is signed by "Devonshire, president, and John E. Gorst, vice-president, of the Committee of Council on Education." Here is the highest authority that there was no urgent and clamant necessity for interfering with elementary education. It is easy to say what was the origin of the introduction into the Education Bill, which was wanted by the country, of all these provisions about elementary schools which were not wanted by the country. It was the demand of the Church party. There is no question about it. I have here circulars they sent out. Their attitude was, "Now or never. Let us take advantage of this great majority. Where shall we be if the election comes to turn on educational issues? Let us make hay while the 1900 South African sun still shines."

Now I come to an argument on today's proceedings which commends itself strongly, I know, to many of my friends, and certainly largely influences people outside—the argument that there has been no mandate for this Bill. I would say at once that I cannot carry this doctrine of a mandate to the full length to which it is pushed. I don't think we can constitutionally fetter the action of any Parliament which may at any time take into consideration the subject which it considers most needs consideration; but at the same time no one can doubt, and everyone knows, the altogether exceptional character of the last general election. I could quote a perfect anthology of the sayings of Ministers, but there is one I have here, so remarkable, that I think it is worth while quoting it. It is the most emphatic of all; and, being emphatic, the House will expect that I should say it comes from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. He proclaimed that Liberals might vote against their party at the election without any prejudice to their Liberal opinions. He said—

> "There had been a wonderful turnover of the mining vote in the North of England. Thousands and thousands of miners who had never voted Unionist before, who still called themselves Liberals and Radicals, had on this occasion supported the Unionist candidate. He did not say that they had changed their views. They were probably Liberal and Radical as before, and they would probably vote for Liberals and Radicals at the next election, but at this election they had voted for the Unionist candidate. Why had they done that? Because they saw that the issue at the present time was not a question of domestic policy, such as Church Disestablishment or Liquor Prohibition, but a question of the existence of the Empire."

How many of these votes would have been secured if the right hon. Gentleman had gone out telling them all, "Every vote given to a Unionist is a vote given against School Boards"?

Up to that point I fully acknowledge the force of this view of the case. The Government are acting, I will not say with a false majority, but with a majority which was not elected on any subject such as this. It is well known, and I am not stating something that can be contradicted. But though that invalidates the power and authority of the Government and may hamper it very much, I do not go so far as to say that an absolutely fresh mandate is required for every great Bill that is to be introduced. What is the feeling of the country now? What evidence have we of that? The right hon. Gentleman indulged in a little sceptical smile and a few sceptical words as to the real nature of the strong feeling which exists outside this House. But I can only say that I am certain of this—and I think most Members of the House on both sides know it—that you have raised the feeling of the Free Churchmen in this country to a warmth of fervour that we have never seen in our generation, and it will not do to put that away with a smile. The mass of them may be poor and humble men, but they are the kind of men who for many generations have been accustomed to win in every battle in which they earnestly and seriously engaged. Then we have had lately half-a-dozen bye-elections since this Bill was introduced. So far as it goes, what does that test of public opinion show? In those six bye-elections the Liberal vote has gone up by 39 per cent., and the Government vote has gone down by 8 per cent.—not very encouraging to right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and not very favourable to the prospects of a peaceable and quiet and permanent settlement on these lines of this great educational question. My contention is that a Bill of this character requires the fullest and freeest discussion, because it is designed for a permanent settlement which affects closely the daily life of the people; it touches the conscience as well as political principle and opinion; and—another fact which is not to be forgotten—once it has passed through the House of Commons it will find its way to the statute book without much chance of emendation or alteration in its course.

Now, would a few days more debate, a few days more delay, have been such a dreadful evil after all? [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] It would have been no evil to education. The schools which the high authorities I have quoted say are excellent, would have gone on all the same. Nothing would have interrupted them, and what evil would have come from it? Supposing there had been delay, or even postponement, what would have happened? So far as I am aware, one thing, and one thing only, would have happened. Inconvenience would have been imposed on Members of this House. These debates are, no doubt, irksome and wearisome, especially to those who do not follow them closely, but something, after all, is due to the public interest. Moreover, is the right hon. Gentleman personally altogether free from blame? He devoted the early part of this year to the Procedure Rules, which again were mainly introduced to suit the comfort and convenience of hon. Members; and what has he gained by them? He has got his dinner hour and his week-end, but I remember warning him that, so far as my own observation and experience, and that of others better qualified than myself to judge, went, his dinner hour at any rate would not conduce to the rapid passage of business; and I think he has found that to be so now.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no, distinctly not.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Well, you have not been able to keep your men here; but that is another matter. I am sure it has not increased the facility for business. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] At all events, here we were, plunged into these Rules, many of which are not yet passed, and many of them, of the most controversial kind, truncated and left half finished, though the best part of the Session was devoted to them. Then we have seen the extraordinary drafting and preparation of this Bill—the *lacunæ* and slips and inconsistencies which the Government themselves found out, and which the less acute minds on this side of the House have also seen. There have been changes of mind throughout the whole proceedings. The right hon. Gentleman is very much struck by the fact that this is a twenty-clause Bill. He seems to measure a Bill by its clauses, but surely if ever there was a case in which you could say *ponderanda, non numeranda*, it should be in regard to the clauses of a Bill. Why, a ten-clause Bill, or, for what I know, a one-clause Bill, could send the House of Commons packing, and establish some sort of government by Cabinet in its place. How much time would it have taken to have gone on as we were going on? Everything was going quietly. It is true, as the right hon. Gentleman says, that the most outstanding and complex questions of difficulty have been passed, and what remained were comparatively easy and unimportant. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman have a little patience? He said that they had had a great deal of long-suffering patience. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] Well, "long-suffering" is a rather unpleasant word to use against those most of whom, either as regards the manner or the matter of their speeches, you can make no complaint; but a little more patience would have seen him through. He brought forward a number of Quixotic and extreme suggestions, such as the question, "Are you going to have all-night sittings in a case of this sort until every one is exhausted?" No; no one out of a lunatic asylum suggests it. But there was this solution of the difficulty to which he did not refer—that is, to be sure, when you have a big Bill of this sort, touching such a thorny question, to give it the best of the session; and certainly, to be sure that it is drawn in such a way as to avoid rather than encourage Amendments. And, lastly, I think you ought, when you have begun it, to go on with it until it has passed through the House of Commons, which would not involve any very exaggerated time, and would save you the necessity of committing this dreadful inroad, as the right hon. Gentleman admits, upon the rights and privileges of Parliament. Our real purpose has been—while we have maintained our opinion, and reserved our opinion on the obnoxious parts of the Bill—to bring order out of educational chaos; but now the decent discussion of the details of this Bill is to be sacrificed to the fiat of the Minister and the ease and convenience of Members. What contribution will be made by the Members to the dignity, renown and efficiency of Parliament? None whatever. On the contrary, a blow will be struck at it. In that, at least, we will have no hand, and I beg to move the Amendment which stands in my name.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That,' in line 1, and to add the words, 'this House declines to entertain a proposal to restrict debate upon a measure which, since it vitally affects the whole working of local government and administration, and, while assuming to establish a permanent system of national education, endows denominational teaching out of the rates without securing full popular control, demands the most searching examination in every particular.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words to the end of line 6, stand part of the Question."

*(4.15.) MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I ask the indulgence of the House, and especially of many hon. Members on this side, while I endeavour to state the reasons which, after much thought and reluctance, compel me, on every ground, and with every sense of duty, consistency, and self-respect, and of regard for the future position of this House, to take the course which I intend to take tonight—namely, to oppose this Motion. I listened with the greatest interest to everything that fell from my right hon. friend tonight, and while I did so the memory of a similar occasion came back upon me with a force which it was almost impossible to resist. I seemed to witness once again the scene which was before us on that occasion, and to hear again the speeches which were made by men, old friends and colleagues of my own, with whom in perfect union I had been working all my Parliamentary; life and I frankly own that the contrast, the glaring contrast, for it is nothing else, between their sentiments and views at that time and the policy which they propose today, is to me one of the most painful, and as regards the future of the Tory party, I consider, one of the most dangerous episodes I remember in a very long Parliamentary career. I will not dwell more, however, upon this, but I must stop for a moment to notice yet another striking contrast between the proceedings of today and upon that occasion; because it raises a rather serious question, and it affords some evidence, I think, of the rather impatient spirit in which the Prime Minister is treating the House upon this occasion. When Mr. Gladstone moved his famous Resolution on the 29th of June 1893, he gave the House a week—till the 6th of July—before it came into operation; but my right hon. friend moved his Resolution tonight, and it is to take effect tomorrow. That is a tribute, I admit, to the mantle of prophecy which has fallen upon one of his colleagues, my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies, for you have, I think, already been reminded that, speaking on Mr. Gladstone's Motion in 1893, he said—

> "The Government for very shame propose to give you a month. The next, perhaps, will give you a week only."

Why, the Prime Minister has done a good deal better than that because between my right hon. friend's Resolution and the hour when the knife is to descend on his victims, he gives us only a single day. But this raises a serious question. It does not rest with the right hon. Gentleman to settle whether or not this resolution is to be carried at a single sitting. What right has he to assume, as he does by the very words of his Motion, that it will be? It is certain that it can be only by the closure if it is; and unless—which I will not believe—he has come to some arrangement with Mr. Speaker beforehand on this subject, what right, I say, has he or any Minister to presume that Mr. Speaker, who is the guardian of our privileges, and, above all, of our rights of speech, will assent to any such proposal, before, at all events, he has heard the views of Gentlemen in all parts of the House? All I know is this, that when a Motion for the closure was made on the first night of Mr. Gladstone's Resolution in 1893, it was emphatically refused by Mr. Speaker Peel, and in these words, for I have referred to them myself—

> "I shall certainly decline to put that Motion."

I shall continue to believe that the present honoured occupant of the Chair—

*MR. SPEAKER: This is quite out of order. The right hon. Gentleman is proceeding now to discuss and even to dictate to the Chair what its course should be. I shall do my duty, I hope, should the occasion arise, but I decline to allow any debate beforehand as to the course I should pursue.

*MR. CHAPLIN: I am most sorry if anything that fell from me gave that impression for a moment to you. I was about to use the very words that fell from you, that the occupant of the Chair might assuredly be trusted to do his duty.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman will understand that I did not imply that he had said anything except in a perfectly courteous manner, but I considered that what he was doing was not in accordance with order and the Rules of the House.

*MR. CHAPLIN: I am extremely sorry if I have committed the slightest breach in that respect; I was arguing against what appeared to me to be the assumption contained in the very words of the Motion, that this proposal must be carried tonight. I pass then, Mr. Speaker, altogether from that branch of the question; merely saying this, that I think there was some justification for the views which struck me with regard to it. The Prime Minister has based his case very much on the necessity for this Motion, if, as he says, we are to preserve the dignity of this Assembly and our power to carry out any legislation at all. Well, Sir, I am quite as anxious as my right hon. friend to maintain the dignity of this Assembly. My complaint of him is this, that by his Rules, which have been referred to already, and on which so much of the time of this session has been spent, he has done so very little to preserve its dignity. That is why I have always quarrelled with his Rules. Undoubtedly there was a strong demand both here and in the country for reforms in Rules in order to check disorder and to curb obstruction. A whole code of Rules was introduced accordingly, and what is the result? Has anything at all been done to preserve the dignity of the House, or check disorder, or curb obstruction? Nothing—practically nothing; and I think it has been proved by the result, and by the necessity for the violent proceedings which are proposed tonight. The night before Parliament assembled, my right hon. friend, I think it was at the Mansion House, passed a glowing eulogium on the House of Commons and what was termed the Mother of Parliaments. I cannot say when I read it in the morning that I entirely agreed with him, and he met with a rather unfortunate reply on the very following day, when a Member of the House, in the course of one of the debates, did his best in a most violent scene to personally assault him while he was in his place upon that Bench. [Cries of "No."]

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): There was no attempt whatever to assault him. Is the right hon. Gentleman's remark in order?

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is merely drawing his own conclusions from what he saw.

MR. T. M. HEALY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to say, in justice to others, that the statement is inaccurate?

*MR. CHAPLIN: If the hon. Member knows that, I will withdraw it instantly. That is the impression which sitting up here the hon. Member gave me, and that was why, I was very glad when I saw the manly form of my right hon. friend the Minister for Agriculture in the way, because I thought the hon. Member would otherwise certainly have succeeded in what I conceived to be his purpose. I am delighted to hear that I have misinterpreted his action. But apart from that unpleasant incident, I think the Prime Minister must have felt that his glowing eulogium was a little out of place when, for a week or ten days afterwards, we were confronted with the still more painful spectacle of Mr. Speaker—I do not wish to use any unparliamentary expression—being what appeared to me bated and heckled for three-quarters of an hour at a time almost daily, by men who apparently had learned that under the new Rules they could do it with impunity. Now, to my mind, these are the things which are sapping the credit and the dignity of the House, and which the Government, by their new Rules, would do nothing to prevent, and I cannot find a letter or a line which has been added to your Rules to punish or restrain the individuals who do them. On the contrary, one Member of this House not so very long ago called another a liar in his place, and because he refused to withdraw the expression, you proceeded to suspend him for the insult which was offered not only to the Member but to the House and to Mr. Speaker in the Chair. Now, the only Rule you introduced against disorder had been discussed, partly altered, then dropped and left in a mangled, incomplete condition, which made the suspension of a Member perpetual. Having suspended the Member in this case you passed a Resolution almost immediately afterwards in order to readmit him within a week, because you thought it would be unfair to take advantage of that state of things.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must say that the right hon. Gentleman is going outside altogether of the Question before the House. This is not a question of order in debate at all.

*MR. CHAPLIN: Of course I always accept your ruling whatever it may be. I was endeavouring to reply to my right hon. friend's argument in support of his proposals, that they were put forward in order to maintain and preserve the dignity of this House. If it is out of order, I will pursue that line of argument no further. But what is the result of these new Rules which you have passed? You find yourselves, as you were repeatedly warned in the course of those debates you would be, worse off than you were before, and now your only escape from the *impasse* in which you find yourselves is to take refuge in this violent proceeding. But surely to gag all the Members of the House of Commons who never offend, either by obstruction, disorder, or undue verbosity, instead of dealing with the guilty individuals, is hardly the way to restore the character, the dignity, or the independence of this House. It is calculated rather, on the other hand, to rouse feelings of injury and resentment on the part of those who do not offend and who do their best at all times to preserve the character of the House of Commons.

My right hon. friend, in the course of his speech, referred to proposals which I have sometimes made over a course of several years for the purpose of establishing individual closure. I hope I shall be in order in replying in a few words to my right hon. friend. He thinks the system altogether impracticable; I reply that he has never tried it, and, at all events, it could not be more futile or more useless than some of the Rules he has passed. In my early days in Parliament there was an unwritten law which brought into existence the most perfect system of individual closure in the world by crying out "Divide, divide!" Well, I still believe, in spite of my right hon. friend, that we could restore to some extent, the enactment of a Rule or Rules, what prevailed in these days, and with complete success, without it. You must remember that the offenders in this particular respect are very few in number; [AN HON. MEMBER on the Opposition Benches: None.] and I believe myself that the plan of individual closure should be tried. I have watched the debates on this Bill pretty closely, and I maintain that there has been comparatively little, and, so far as my experience has gone, I think many of these debates were extremely good, very instructive, and have led to very considerable alterations in the Bill. Well, but if that is so, what I have to say in reply to my right hon. friend is, that I do not think that the debates under such circumstances ought to be violently stopped, and after all I think we should remember that the right hon. Gentleman is to a considerable extent responsible himself for trying to pass a whole code of new Rules, and what he and everybody knew would be a most controversial measure, during one and the same session.

But what is the inference which we are to draw from the speech of my right hon. friend? He rejects continuous sessions, and although he himself somewhat favours another plan, what he called of "carrying over," that plan apparently fell as flat during his statement this afternoon on the minds of his audience as it did on the Committee over which he says that he presided many years ago. It only adds to the objection I feel to his proposal tonight, and the only inference which I can draw is this—that the scheme is not to be exceptional, but to be habitual, and in future it is to form a part of the ordinary procedure and practice of this Assembly. I say that that is an alternative which I dread, and for which there is no necessity whatever. What is the Clause which you have selected upon which to begin to put your gagging scheme into operation? The right hon. Gentleman said at the Mansion House last night that almost everything in connection with this Bill had been discussed except education; but there is one thing that has never been discussed, and that is the Clause dealing with the expenses for carrying the Bill.

Well, now, tomorrow we ought to have reached a very important Clause—Clause 13—which many of us think is perhaps the most important in the Bill. I am not forgetting for a moment that my right hon. friend has made considerable concessions already on this subject. He has promised that £900,000 should be contributed to the voluntary schools from the Imperial funds in addition to the grants we have already. But there have been considerable changes in the Bill since then, and the further information which has been developed in the course of these debates with regard to the condition of many of the voluntary schools has led to the belief that that concession is very far from adequate, unless we are to be saddled in the future with burdens on the rates infinitely greater than anything that has hitherto been contemplated. Throughout the whole of these discussions this is the first opportunity, for which we have been waiting, of saying anything at all on this most important question, and I can assure my right hon. friend that the keenest anxiety is felt in the rural districts on the subject. I have had, I don't know how many letters and telegrams on the subject—in fact I am receiving them every minute—since it was known that the plan of my right hon. friend was to move the closure on this very Clause on the night on which it was to be discussed. This is a subject in which I am greatly interested, and in which I know I represent feelings which are widely held in the country, and which we think ought to be fully and amply discussed before this Bill is forced through the House of Commons. Now there is an Amendment to Clause 13 on the Paper which raises the whole of this important question, viz., how far it is right that the cost of education, which is admittedly a matter of national concern, ought to fall at all on the local rates. But it is not the first on the Paper. On the contrary, there are a number of Amendments to Clause 12, including an Amendment raising the whole question of secondary education. I think it is likely — it is certainly quite possible—that this very important question in regard to the rates may not be reached at all. What will be the position then? The Bill adds an unknown burden to the rates. Many of my friends believe that these will be infinitely heavier in the course of time—and I suspect that they have good grounds for their belief—than was even for a moment thought of when the Bill was introduced. I myself am deeply pledged against it, and so I believe is the great majority of hon. Members who took part in the election of 1895. I hold in my hand the pledges given by the leading Members of the Cabinet in 1895, on this particular subject.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now discussing the merits of Clause 13, and the Amendments proposed to it. He is not in order.

*MR. CHAPLIN: Well, I pass from the point; and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me so much liberty as you have done. I do not wish to delay the House by reading out these pledges, because they are matters on which every man must judge for himself. I desire to pass judgment upon no man; but for myself, I wish to say that I have no alternative: I cannot vote today for closuring an Amendment to a Clause which would otherwise impose heavy and increased burdens on the rates and a Clause which may not even be reached at all. The right hon. Gentleman has tonight given us a considerable number of statistics, but one thing is quite certain that if he has his way we shall have no chance of testing the accuracy of these statistics until after this Motion is passed. I do not believe for a single moment that there is any real necessity for this Motion. My right hon. friend has referred to Mr. Gladstone's Motions, both on the Home Rule Bill and the Evicted Tenants Bill in 1893 and 1894 I should have thought that these were evil precedents which ought to afford us warnings, rather than examples to be followed. But why did Mr. Gladstone move his Resolution on the Home Rule Bill? Because he told the House of Commons at that time that at their then rate of progress the task which had been undertaken by him and by the Liberal Party, as a task alike of honour and of policy, and by which they were bound, was beyond the limits of human attainment without the Closure. Now that I know the facts, I begin to think that Mr. Gladstone was right, and that without it he never could have carried his measure through the House of Commons. Why, it took twenty-eight days' discussion to pass four Clauses, and at that rate Mr. Gladstone stated that twelve months would not have been sufficient to carry his measure into law. As a matter of fact, the Home Rule Bill, even in spite of the gagging Closure which was applied to it, was debated for no less than seventy-eight days altogether. But no one pretends that in the present condition of affairs there is anything approaching to that state of things. Four considerable Clauses of this Bill were carried in almost as many hours as the four Clauses of the Home Rule Bill took days—they were carried quite recently in something under thirty hours, and I am convinced that if my right hon. friend had persevered in the course which he has adopted up to this time, using the Closure as he has done lately, the Committee on this Bill would have been completed in probably another week, and if it had not been for the three months practically wasted as, I think, in the earlier part of the Session on the Rules of Procedure, this Bill would have probably been law before the present time. My right hon. friend said of Mr. Gladstone's Resolution in 1893, that it was not a Motion of necessity, but of expediency. I say tonight that my right hon. friend's Resolution is neither of necessity nor of expediency, but of convenience only. It is, in fact, a repetition on a larger scale of the famous Lyttlestone incident, which occurred during the passage of our Rules, when the House of Commons, on a certain Thursday, was kept up all one night by my right hon. friend for no necessity whatever. It was in order to pass a certain Rule before the House adjourned. There was no important business on the Friday. The Rule could have perfectly been finished then, although it might perhaps have somewhat interfered with other pursuits at Lyttlestone on Saturday. I have always thought, and said, that it was the highest tribute to the well-earned popularity of the Minister, that I ever recollect, that not a word of anger or resentment, at any rate so far as I know, was ever heard about it, even from those who suffered from it like myself. But he must forgive me if I say that, in my humble opinion, whatever it may be worth, neither the popularity, nor the power of any Minister, will long survive the constant repetition of high-handed coups like this.

Now, Sir, I have nothing more that I need say upon this subject, and I will bring my observations to a close. I have given to the House a variety of reasons which weigh with me in my decision, but there is one which is supreme above them all. I am thinking of the freedom of the future of this great Assembly. I remember the speech of the Prime Minister in opposing Mr. Gladstone's Resolution in 1893. I remember well his words on that occasion, words which I think have been already quoted on that side of the House tonight. Let me repeat them once again. They will be well worth recollecting, looking to their consequences in the future.

> "I do not look upon this question in any way as connected with Home Rule. I do not come here to oppose this Resolution as a Unionist, but because I think it is absolutely inconsistant with the very elements of the life of a free debating Assembly."

Those words, Sir, I believe were wise and just on the day when they were spoken. I believe them to be no less wise and no less just today. And holding this conviction, and believing in my heart and conscience, as I do, that they are as true today as they were in 1893, there is only one path open to me tonight, the path which is dictated alike by honour, by consistency, and duty—and that is, to oppose this Motion.

(4.50.) DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I confess, I myself feel very tired of the Education Bill, and I desire to see it brought to an end as soon as may be, but I would venture to point out this fact. We are settling in this Bill the principle of education of the homeland of this great Empire, for it may be twenty or thirty years. The school machinery of the Bill may affect the present interest of 6,000,000 working class children; it may affect, before its work is complete, the interest of 60,000,000 children. I do, therefore, regret the impatience shown by the Prime Minister just now, and suggest that it is a little bit unpatriotic, having regard to the enormous issues contained in the Bill before us. Whatever our personal opinions may be, and whatever sacrifices we may make, it behoves us, I think, to examine with strictness the details of this important measure. Birmingham has been told by the right hon. Gentleman, the Colonial Secretary, that this was not a perfect Bill and that the Government welcome suggestions. We have met the right hon. Gentleman halfway; we have agreed with him that the Bill was not perfect, and we have done what we could to improve it. We have, it is true, been thirty-eight days in Committee, and the proceedings have been rather protracted, but it must be remembered that this is a Bill which sweeps entirely away no less than 2,500 public authorities which have been doing admirable public work for thirty years: it affects 14,000 other authorities not public authorities, which have been charged for a similar period with the education of the youth of the country. This is a Bill which breaks down the system by which all the schools of this country have been maintained by voluntary subscriptions. This is a Bill which insists that all education shall be maintained at the public cost. This is a Bill which enforces a system of local rating for education. What does that mean? It means an absolutely new rate for 9,000,000 of the people of this country; a new rate for 117 urban boroughs, 92 urban districts, and probably not less than 5,000 parishes. I say it is no doubt excellent and desirable so far as it goes, but it calls for extreme circumspection and care. I agree that most parts of this Bill have been adopted after considerable consideration and lengthy debate, but I do not think the right hon. Gentleman is correct in saying that all the part of the Bill which has at present been adopted has been adopted after great consideration. Clauses 9, 10 and 11 were rushed through the Committee in a way that could not be regarded as wise; Clause 9 was taken at one Sitting, after four applications of the Closure; Clauses 10 and 11 were taken at one Sitting after the Closure had been applied three times. I do not mind the rating. Consequences will follow, must follow, and in the endeavour to prevent their following I am a sort of educational Mrs. Partington. But inasmuch as these Clauses, taken in two nights after seven applications of the Closure, sweep all new schools into the denominational byways, by giving a preference in favour of private buildings, I object to that very much. That, I think, is the feature which will be one of the worst fetters of the Bill in ten years time, although I agree that many of the provisions of the Bill are admirable.

Look at what we are asked to do under this Resolution of the Prime Minister. I will not go into more than one or two points of detail, and I observe that the right hon. Gentleman never got near them in his statement. What are we going to do in the next fortnight or three weeks? Tomorrow and tonight, after disposing of this lengthy Motion, we are asked to dispose of the latter part of Clause 12, and in addition to that we have to dispose of Clause 13. Let me call the attention of the House to Clause 13. In my opinion, the right hon. Member for Sleaford has not laid anything like sufficient stress on Clause 13, which is to be disposed of by tomorrow night. It deals with the whole question of expenditure; the whole finance of public education; the incidence of rating; whether it shall be on the county, on the district, on the borough; the extremely important question of outstanding liabilities and how they are to be reduced. This Clause involves first of all an increased rate over every district which now has a rate; it involves a new rate to the extent of at least £2,000,000 in districts which never had a rate before; it involves a special treatment of no less than £20,000,000 of outstanding loans contracted by educational authorities now existing, outstanding liabilities to the extent of £50 in the case of a small School Board, and rising to half a million in, say, the case of the Leeds School Board. All that has to be reduced until the liability has been met. All these considerations are to be dealt with tomorrow night. I notice there are sixty or eighty Amendments on the Paper dealing with this Clause, and among those Amendments there are many in the names of hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen opposite; the right hon. Gentleman has two, and the Secretary to the Board of Education four. Where do we come in? There is one in the name of the right hon. Member for Sleaford, and one in the name of the hon. Member for East Somerset, who has so materially assisted the Government in the improvement of this Bill. How are all those important Amendments to be taken in this headlong way before tomorrow night? There is one thing I should like to call attention to, and that is the question of this new million which is to be granted by the Treasury, this new aid grant. At Friday's sitting we are to take Clauses 18, 19 and 20, and the Committee stage of the new financial Resolution, disposing of something like a million of money, and we are finally to dispose of it on the following Monday. Then I may call the attention of the Attorney General to the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897. There was a Bill which dealt with £760,000. That Bill took the House seventeen sittings in Committee, and we are to be given less than one itting to dispose of practically a million of money. If seventeen sittings were required to dispose of £760,000 it is curious that we should be allowed only part of one sitting to dispose of £1,000,000. Next Thursday week, under this time-table, we are to have under consideration and conclude the Committee stage of the Schedules, with practically no possible chance of any discussion on any of these things. One of the parts involved in the stupendous work set down for November 20th is Schedule 4. In that schedule it is proposed to repeal thirty-two years of educational statutes of this country, two statutes entirely, four statutes in part, ninety-six sections to be repealed in full, and sixty in part, many of which have no concern with what has been said in the discussions on this Bill. They do not emerge in this Bill. If I were challenged I could call attention to statutes which we are called upon to repeal which do not arise on the Clauses we have added to this Bill to save the blunders of it. I venture to protest against the policy of rushing this Bill at this stage. I know it has been a long time in Committee, and that the Prime Minister has been patient. I only wish his patience had lasted to the end. This Bill is going into the country with a sense of irritation on the part of the people, and the proceeding we are now engaged in must exasperate the feeling and accentuate that irritation and make the Bill less satisfactory than it might otherwise be. The present policy is not a wise policy, and will not make for educational progress in the country. I venture to think we should go on and do the best we can, and give all the time that may be necessary to the full and complete discussion of this Bill, so that we may make a great and effective measure of it.

*(5.9.) MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I am not surprised that the opposition to this Motion should have been based on the special grounds of this Bill and not so much on general grounds. Some hon. Gentlemen opposite consider that this scheme will degrade the House of Commons to the level of a voting machine, but I do not see how, after his action in 1893 and 1894, any other line could well have been taken by the right hon. Gentleman. I do not wish to support this Resolution on any special grounds; I do not wish to enter into the question as to how far the Bill has been fully discussed; what the merits of the Amendments have been and whether there was any obstruction. I am quite prepared to assume that there has been no obstruction whatever; that the Amendments have been reasonable, and that they have not been pressed at too great a length in argument, but I think the question remains whether it is right or possible for this House to spend the amount of time in these most minute discussions which this Bill has undergone, and which it is the growing tendency of the House of Commons to enter into in all questions in which all are interested. The Prime Minister, with wise economy, did not go into the general question. He did not go into the question of whether it was expedient to lay down a general Rule on this House—a system which should make the House have a limit of this kind, not as an exceptional necessity but as a regular Standing Order. I do not agree that the introduction of a general Rule of this sort would reduce the House to the level of a voting machine. I think it would have quite a contrary effect; that it would offer this House fair time for considering any great question brought

before it in a way no other change could do. At present we are unable to give an intelligent judgment; we are unable to have before us in proportionate length, and in a close enough focus, the questions with which we have to deal. Everybody has felt the overwhelming burden of the work of this House, which was one of the most pressing reasons which Mr. Gladstone gave in bringing in the Home Rule Bill. We have all suffered from disappointment in the way we have seen work set back session after session, because of the impossibility of getting that limited amount of time which is necessary to pass into law measures on which all are substantially agreed. It is made impossible to obtain that short amount of time for many of our measures, by the claim of the House of Commons to examine into every detail of every measure that comes before it. Are these measures really made the better for the exercise of that right? I for my part doubt it very much. I do not think this House is the place for minute discussions on small points; even if they are substantial points, I think the House should limit itself to the broader issues placed before it. The old system had great merits. Under the old system, when a Bill was to be brought in, a set of Resolutions was brought before the House, which voted upon them, and they were finally put into the shape of a Bill by those responsible for the Bill.

This Bill has already more than exhausted the limited amount of time you have at your disposal for legislation in a normal session. Granted that the Amendments are reasonable and substantial, yet the House has to consider the amount of time spent on this Bill as compared with the whole work of the House of Commons in the whole session. Such a point as that cannot come into the question of closure. The Chairman has to consider on the question of closure the rights of the minority. It would be impossible to put on the Chair the responsibility of weighing the importance of the question before the House at the time, in comparison with the whole amount of work to be done. But considerations of that sort must come in, and they are fully accepted as the basis of the new Rules governing Supply. We have fixed the time within narrow limits for one of our most important functions—the question of Supply. The order in which it is to be put can be arranged, and the effect of our arranging the different times is such that the most important questions come under consideration, and the less important can be left. That has been a great advantage. It has had a most satisfactory result, which will be felt by all of us who remember the old system, that the ratcatcher to St. James's Palace has vanished into the obscurity suitable for him. I should like the Government, not only with regard to this Bill but others, to follow the same system, but there is a strong dread in the minds of Members on this side of the House, as well as on the other, who say this scheme would reduce the House to the level of a voting machine. On this side, Gentlemen are afraid of setting a precedent for the other side, and of too much legislation being carried through if changes of this sort are made. But the jealousy of legislation and the exaggeration of the mischievous consequence of legislation of secondary importance are small matters compared with the great necessity of getting business through Parliament. Supposing our opponents come into office: they already have the power which some hon. Members fear, they have absolute control over administration, foreign relations, expenditure, and Standing Orders; they can alter Standing Orders to suit themselves without any interference from the House of Lords. The only condition upon which we can run a free country like this is that those who are in power should have the responsibility of power and the opportunity of carrying out their policy effectively. It therefore seems to me to be a very false and untrustworthy protection to rely on a system by which mechanical and artificial difficulties are put in the way of legislation. Even without altering Standing Orders, whatever Party is in power with a strong majority can carry through a big measure on which their hearts are set in the way that the Home Rule and the Evicted Tenants Bills were carried through, and for this the present measure will furnish a further precedent.

In the Unionist Party in particular, this jealousy of legislation is misplaced. Hitherto we have not so much depended on our legislation for the confidence of the country. We have had the questions of Home Rule and the War, and those two great questions have been at the bottom of the continuous support which the nation has given us. I hope in these coming years no such exciting questions may arise, but that we may find a more humdrum course in which it will be efficiency on which we shall have to depend if we are to retain the confidence of the nation. Efficiency has many elements, but certainly one of its important elements is that of being able to pass the necessary amount of legislation from year to year. This unexciting legislation is what suffers the most from the present state of things. It gets hung up from the beginning to the end of the Session, and then, if it goes through at all, it is in an unsatisfactory manner, as the result of a somewhat undignified bargain between the Government and individual sections of the House.

Can the House of Commons, under present conditions, do the necessary work of the country? I do not think it can. Could it do so if it altered its Rules so as to concentrate its attention on vital matters, and escape an undue amount of talk over matters of secondary, tertiary, or fourth-rate importance? I believe it could. The case of Supply is an example of the change in the nature of discussion, and in the value of the work done, that can be brought about by a change in our Standing Orders. Therefore, I hope it will not be only with regard to exceptional matters, but in regard to our every day practice that such a change may be made.

This is not the only Legislative Assembly that has been overburdened by the amount of its work. The same difficulty has been experienced in the American Congress, and there it has been met much more boldly than here. There the Committee on Rules has the power absolutely to lay down the amount of time to be devoted to an individual Bill. That process is continually adopted, and by that means an adequate amount of work is got through. By a fair and impartial Committee there may be laid down beforehand the amount of time that justly represents the share of the whole time of the House to which each subject is entitled. In Congress the responsibility is taken by the Committee on Rules with the Speaker in the Chair. But according to our ideas, it is not a duty or responsibility which lies on the Speaker; it is one that should be taken by the House itself, or by a Committee representing the House—by such a Committee as has often been offered to the Opposition by the Prime Minister in regard to Supply, one in which the Government would not even be dominant, of which the Leader of the House should be the Chairman, and on which the Opposition should be duly represented. I believe that it is only by entering upon a bolder scheme of that sort that we shall get through the work of the House of Commons. The changes which have been made in our Rules may meet individual difficulties and small points, but I hope we shall before long take a broader view of what is necessary if the House is to do its work, and it is mainly as a precedent towards that change and the adoption of such a method as that to which I have referred, that I welcome the Resolution of the Government.

(5.25.) MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I do not intend to follow the last speaker into a general dissertation on the possibilities of dealing with our business. We all agree that the necessity, as the Government allege, for bringing forward this Motion is an unpleasant one, and in the speech made by the Premier today, in which he called up the precedent of the Home Rule Bill of 1893, there was at least that point of similarity with the speech in which Mr. Gladstone proposed his Closure Resolutions. But with that expression of regret at what he thought it necessary to do the similarity ended. The underlying phrase, if I may call it so, of Mr. Gladstone's speech was this:—

> "To deal with this measure is exactly the commission we (the Government) have received from our constituents."

There is the difference between the two situations. The Home Rule Bill was in response to a mandate from the country. It is true there was a small majority, but the election had been directly and practically solely upon that issue. In this case there is no mandate from the country. So far is that from being the case that there is not a single allusion to the Education Bill in the election address of either of the Members who have taken any important part in this Bill. You can search the speeches of right hon. Gentlemen who are now sitting on the Treasury Bench, and you will find no allusion whatever to the subject of education. The Colonial Secretary made one speech on home questions, all the others being on the war, and that one speech was made because a working man tried to challenge his supremacy, and the whole of it was devoted to attacking the Labour Members at present in Parliament. Therefore, one of the chief points which we urge tonight is that, as the country have had no opportunity of discussing this Bill at a general election, we have a right in this House to the fullest and freest discussion on behalf of the country, and that the Government have no right to curtail that discussion.

But let us come at once to the question of whether the discussion has been so prolonged, considering the circumstances of the case. The Premier pointed out that when Mr. Gladstone introduced his Closure Resolutions with regard to the Home Rule Bill, that measure had been under discussion for twenty-one days. What we have to consider is how many days the two Bills will have been under discussion if the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman are carried into effect. The number of days in Committee and on Report which the Education Bill will take under these proposals is 48; the number of days which the Home Rule Bill took was 61. It may be said that the Home Rule Bill was a greater Bill. Of course it was. But it was essentially a sketch, which had to be filled in by legislators and administrators after it was passed. There is no need to discuss whether they would have filled it in properly; the fact is that that Bill was essentially a general scheme, which had to be filled in afterwards. This Education Bill is a finished and detailed arrangement with regard to the education of the country which is being introduced as a substitute for another equally elaborate system. It is this fact, together with that of the bad Government drafting, to which these long discussions have been due. There never was a Bill brought into this House which has been so much amended as this one. Take the Bill as far as we have gone. The original Measure down to nearly the end of Clause 12 consisted of 160 lines; of those original lines there are 122 left, and 123 new lines have been inserted. Does it not rather look as if it were bad drafting and not wilful obstruction on the part of the Opposition? It rather argues that this House as a whole has been very reasonable and has proposed very reasonable Amendments, and the Government has found it necessary to accept them.

Let me look at the effect of these discussions from another point of view. I take the Amendments to the most important Clause we have yet discussed, namely, Clause 8. I have been through the Amendments to that Clause. I find there were forty-one Amendments proposed to Clause 8, and of these, two were introduced by the Government, eleven were brought forward by supporters of the Government, nine were brought forward by Liberal Members, and were either accepted or withdrawn on the pledge of the Government that they would practically carry them into effect. No less than twenty-two Amendments out of the forty-one on that Clause were moved in the interests or with the approval of the Government. Of the rest, fourteen were such as I think nobody could deny were important Amendments, concerning questions like the appointment of teachers, whether they should perform extraneous duties or not, all questions which hon. Members were interested in, and are of serious importance. Of the remainder, there were only five Amendments which would come under the category of what the Prime Minister called "trumpery details." The last speaker objected to the discussion of trumpery details at all, but where can we discuss those details? We cannot discuss only the important things here and send the trumpery details somewhere else. I do not think that five trumpery details out of forty-one Amendments is a very large proportion, and does not indicate unreasonable discussion on the part of the Opposition. The Amendments have been neither obstructive nor destructive of the Bill. It is true that a few have been destructive of the policy which the Government regarded the Bill as carrying out, but I do not think that a single Amendment has been destructive in the sense as many of those were which were moved against the Home Rule Bill, which would have made the Measure unworkable had they passed. There is another point of view, and that is in regard to the next few days during which this Closure will come into operation.

The hon. Member for North Camberwell has referred to this point. Under sub-Section (*f*) of this Resolution, we are to discuss on Wednesday and Thursday—

> "(*f*) The proceedings on the new Clause relating to managers, and any other Government new Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, on Thursday, 20th November."

It appears to me to be a very dangerous thing to curtail a discussion of that kind. It is one thing to Closure Clauses and Schedules which are on the Paper, but it is quite another thing to practically give the Government a free hand to put down at the last moment any Clauses they like, and push them through by a sudden Closure. We might have the Scottish system introduced by this means—or perhaps the Scottish system of the catechism party without the control. The Premier is very fond of that. We might have any Clause closured through in the last minute. It seems to me that there is no necessity for this proposal. The discussion, so far, has been practical from beginning to end. The Amendments added to the Bill prove the satisfactory character of the discussion and the way the Government has had to recognise it. This Motion is simply one for the convenience of the Government, and nothing else.

(5.35.) MR. ELLIOT (Durham) said he did not think that anyone underrated the importance of the proposal before the House. The question was whether or not, as regarded the merits of a proposal which had an enormous support on this side of the House, the Government and the House of Commons was to be rendered inefficacious by an interminable prolongation of debate. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford had referred to the state of things in the old days, and it was true that the practice which then existed was closure by clamour. It was found, however, that the system of closure by clamour absolutely broke down when it was persistently resisted, and it was in consequence of the absolute breakdown of closure by clamour that the new system of closure was inaugurated. If they were to retain their title as a legislative body, it behoved them to see that certain Rules were enforced in order that they might be enabled to carry on their business as well as to carry on debate. He thought it had been admitted by the Leader of the House that the present difficulties had not arisen from anything in the slightest degree of an obstructive character. His view of the matter was this: he had attended regularly, and he had read what had been said in the country, and he could not close his eyes to the fact that it was the intention of a large number of the opponents of this measure not only to waste time but to kill the Bill, and it was the duty of the Prime Minister, as guardian of the dignity and the privileges of the House of Commons, to put down such tactics. It was quite competent for the House to pass the remaining Clauses of the Bill in two days if necessary, but he did not think it ought to do so. But those who made it their Party strategy to defeat measures, not by argument but by tactics to cause delay, ought to remember that there was an inherent power which, if the majority chose to exercise it and put its foot down, must sweep away those tactics, and this would have to be done if the House of Commons was to remain a legislative as well as a debating Assembly. This Bill might be complicated in the working out, but in the way it had been laid before the House it was not complicated. It was a measure to enable local authorities to make their own schemes, whereas formerly this work had devolved upon the House of Commons itself. He knew these were difficult points, but in complexity this Bill compared favourably with other great measures. If they looked back to the old full dress Second Reading debates in the days of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, he did not think that, compared with those, the debates on this measure had been shortened. If they turned up *Hansard* of the old days and looked through the number of nights occupied, they would find that while Second Reading debates went to a very considerable length indeed, the Committee stage rarely occupied much time. The only way of protecting the liberties of debate was by having stringent Rules. He dissented from the view that the dignity of the House of Commons depended upon ample latitude to every individual to speak as often and as long as he desired. He had been in the House of Commons for a considerable time, and on whatever side he had been sitting he had on every single occasion when Rules had been brought forward to strengthen order and give greater effect to the will of the House, supported those Rules, and he should certainly not make this an exception to the rule he had hitherto followed. Their liberties and usefulness went very much together. His hon. friend the Member for the Elland Division talked of what was done in connection with the Home Rule Bill of 1892. That might have been a "sketch," but he would remind his hon. friend that it was a sketch which was carefully kept dark until the eve of the General Election. The hon. Member said that Mr. Gladstone had a mandate in 1892 to carry a Home Rule Bill. If there was anything in that argument it involved a system of annual Parliaments, or, at all events, oftener than under the septennial system. There was no chance of a majority of this Parliament accepting annual Parliaments or anything like it, and until that was done it was useless to talk as if Parliament had no mandate except to carry out a particular measure. To carry out the views of the hon. Member, what would have happened when peace came? Apparently it would have been the duty of the Government to at once dissolve Parliament. Why should this Government act in a different way from that in which hon. Gentlemen opposite would act in similar circumstances? The question they had to consider was, Are we to pass this Bill or are we not? Were they to carry over the discussion of the Bill into February or March? He did not think hon. Members had grasped what that meant. Everybody could not speak on the Bill. They must devise, somehow or another, measures for the House of Commons to do its work. He thought most of them would dislike any revolutionary measures, and the best way to keep those measures at a distance was to pass such a moderate and reasonable scheme as his right hon. friend had laid before the House. He heard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Sleaford Division say that the Leader of the House would very soon lose his popularity and credit if he hustled measures of this importance through Parliament. This was no case of hustling. Never before had so much delay been shown in the discussion of the details of a Bill. He could not help noticing that there were half a dozen Motions on the Paper in identically the same terms, and yet hon. Members were inclined to say that this proposal of the Government was calculated to lower the House of Commons to the position of a voting machine. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Those were the words of the Colonial Secretary."] That was the reason, he supposed, why the happy thought had struck half a dozen Members at once! He would not ask hon. Members to throw back their memories a long way. He would ask them to throw back their memories to Friday last, when they had ten or twelve divisions on the Education Bill. For a couple of hours they were acting very much like a voting machine. Those who said that Parliament was being degraded to the mere position of a voting machine were themselves committing that very crime. It was to save the House of Commons from that unsatisfactory state of things, and to enable to become law a Bill which had the support of the immense majority of the British people, that he would give no equivocal support to the Motion.

(5.50.) MR. JOHN ELLIS: If the hon. Member for Durham will allow me to say so, I cannot congratulate him on the tone and temper in which he has addressed us. It seems to me that some of the expressions he let fall are hardly worthy of him, and I venture to think they do not add either to the dignity or efficiency of our debate. We all welcomed the tone in which the Prime Minister introduced this matter to us, and I am quite willing to accept his challenge and to consider it; as the hon. Member pointed out, it ought to be considered from deeper aspects than that of a particular Bill. The Prime Minister invited us to look at the matter on both sides of the House, and to remember that Parties at one time sit at your right hand and at another time at your left. That, I venture to say, is the point of view from which we shall regard the Motion of the Prime Minister. The more we do that the more we shall contribute to the dignity of the House of Commons, and enable it to transact its business efficiently and with greater rapidity. I venture to make a confession. The noble Lord the Secretary for India stood in a white sheet last night and told us that he had purged himself of his bi-metallic sins. I venture to confess to the House of Commons that my two Parliamentary sins were voting for this kind of Resolution in 1893 and 1894. I have regretted that ever since, and so long as I am a Member of the House of Commons, I will never vote for such a Motion. These things work their own cure, and I believe that, from the Party point of view, the Resolution which I suppose will be carried tonight or tomorrow will work evil to the Conservative Party throughout the land. I am an anti-Closure man. I have said before that I believe the use of the closure marks the Parliamentary incapacity of those concerned in its use, and they are not entitled to the respect on the part of the House of Commons to which in my judgment the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton are entitled, the one having piloted the Finance Act reforming the death duties, and the other the Parish Councils Act, without the aid of the Closure. The passing of Bills through this House is a matter of temper and tact, the drafting of Bills, and the volume of opinion behind them in the country. I was delighted to hear the Prime Minister confess frankly and fairly in the face of the House that there had been nothing worth calling Parliamentary obstruction with respect to this Bill, and I hope that, that having been said publicly in this House by the Minister who has charge of the Bill, we shall hear no charge of that kind in the country. No man has a right to go down to his constituents and say that there has been any obstruction in respect of this Bill, after that statement by the Prime Minister.

The right hon. Gentleman gave us some information with regard to the number of days Bills had been in Committee. I maintain with absolute confidence that you cannot exhaust the matter in that way. It is not a matter of arithmetic. There are other elements and circumstances. What is the nature of this Bill? What has been its career in this House? What are the circumstances attendant upon its origin and introduction to the House? There has been no popular demand for the Bill. That is my first observation. I am old enough to recollect very well the meetings that took place in 1869, prior to the introduction of the Bill of 1870. I had the honour to be chairman of one of the local authorities set up under that Bill. I remember there were meetings all over the country, where working men attended in thousands demanding a Bill. It was just after the enfranchisement of the working men in 1867. No such demand has been made today. You have had private meetings and meetings of Convocation. That was the origin and source of the Bill, and it is on an entirely different footing to the great measure of 1870. Then as regards the nature of the Bill, I cannot admit, with a leading journal, that this is a short and simple measure. I think I may claim to know something as to the drafting of Bills. It is sometimes my duty to look into them and to judge whether the Amendments will run into the framework. Having given my mind to the subject, I say deliberately that after I saw the Bill, so drafted and so worded, I sympathised with the Chairman of Committees trying to do his duty under the most arduous circumstances in regard to Amendments. If we could get at the mind of the Chairman in respect to this Bill, I am sure we would find that it was most difficult for him to think what Amendments were, or were not, in order. The Bill was so drawn that the Chairman might, with the best intentions in the world, make mistakes in his rulings. That should not be the case. The Amendments raised by the Bill were multitudinous, as it re-cast the whole system of local government. The Prime Minister last night said that we had been dealing in these discussions with anything but education. I have no doubt that education is the most paramount thing in the mind of the Prime Minister, but he has lost sight of the manner in which the Bill touches many great problems of local government, and more especially the rights of conscience. The number of Amendments is a proof, as was pointed out by my hon. friend below me, of the slovenly drafting of the Bill. In its passage through Committee no less than)120 lines have been added to the Bill by Amendments, and if hon. Members take the trouble to go through every Clause and count the lines in the Bill they will find that just in proportion as the Committee was allowed full and free discussion, in that proportion the Bill has been amended. Words have been dropped out and others inserted, and these figures alone, I venture to say, form an ample and entire justification for every hour which has been spent in Committee on this Bill.

I have some ground, and I think the House has some ground, for complaint of the conduct of the Bill and the action of the Prime Minister. When a Minister is conducting a great Bill like this, it is a most unwise thing for him during that process to make a great Party political speech outside the House. It re-acts on the minds of the Committee, and when the Prime Minister went down to Manchester and made that great speech, and said that the Bill would not do this, that, or the other thing, he was not treating the House of Commons quite fairly. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!" and "No."] I will explain. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the Prime Minister, except from a Parliamentary procedure point of view. The right hon. Gentleman should have put down his Amendments on the Paper, rather than go with them to a public platform. The old Parliamentary way was, when a Minister was conducting a Bill like this, never to open his mouth on a public platform in respect to it during its progress through Committee, but to put the Amendments he desired to see made down on the Paper. That, I maintain, contributes to the smooth passage of a Bill. I see the Chancellor of the Exchequer present. No one knows better than he that there is nothing like taking your fellow Members into your confidence and putting your Amendments on the Paper. In addition to that, I maintain that there has been a want of practical knowledge and experience on the part of those conducting the Bill, that has not contributed to its progress. The Prime Minister has been fair and reasonable, and I would be sorry to say anything in the least personally discourteous to him, but I venture to say that of the three Ministers conducting this great Bill not one of them has had a seat on a local authority in this country. They have had no practical experience. Two of them come from beyond the Tweed, and I have noticed that Scotsmen find particular difficulty at times in understanding our religious difficulties. They are happily so free from that kind of thing north of the Tweed that they do not quite enter into the feelings of the Nonconformists especially. Therefore, I maintain that there has been, to some extent, a want of practical acquaintance with the subject with which these three Ministers are dealing. Sitting here in this corner, for the most part as a silent Member, I have been a most interested spectator of the proceedings in Committee. The House of Commons is after all a most interesting place. You see a good deal of human nature displayed, and if you watch the passage of a Bill through Committee you can gauge the capacity of those conducting it. Nothing has astonished me more than the great gulf on this Education Bill between what is going on in the House and what is going on outside. Why, the papers teem with letters from hon. Gentlemen opposite, but they are not followed up by speeches in the House. We see bishops and the clergy all writing on the supposition that we are conducting this Bill through the House in a spirit of sweet reasonableness, and that ample time has been allowed us to make Amendments. As we know here, the state of things has been very different. I venture to say that no case has been made out for the violent method proposed in the Resolution now before us. I believe the Bill comes without any due Parliamentary authority, and it is being passed with a want of appreciation, even on the part of those who support it, of its inimical effect on the great question of national education. I venture to say that the exercise of a little more time and patience on the part of those conducting the Bill would have been a much better method of securing the object they have at heart than this Resolution, which, to my mind, to use a rather vulgar term, bears the stamp that it comes from Birmingham, and has been adopted to degrade the House of Commons to the mere position of a voting machine.

MR. WANKLYN (Bradford, Central) said that he had had the honour in 1895 to be returned to Parliament for the city of Bradford on the question of the co-ordination of education and the support of the voluntary schools. The first speech he had delivered in the

House in 1897 was in support of denominational schools and of the system instituted by his great predecessor Mr. W. E. Forster. In 1900 he had again the honour to be sent to Parliament as a supporter of denominational schools, and his opponent, who was the Chairman of the Technical Instruction Committee of the West Riding, put education in the forefront of his programme. So far as his Parliamentary experience went, education, the coordination of education, and the placing of the voluntary schools on the rates, had been in the forefront of the battle always. It had been admitted by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord that there had been no wanton obstruction. An hon. Member opposite, in the course of a debate, said that time was a Parliamentary weapon, and that they meant to use it. While there had been no wanton obstruction, and no personal abuse, it could not be denied that time had been used as a Parliamentary weapon, and that there had been a waste of time and words. That was within the common knowledge of all present. In the North of England a waste of words and a waste of time was regarded as a waste of money. It was lamentable that the heads of great Departments of the State and Ministers of the Crown should be detained in this House four nights a week for nine or ten months in the year till one or two in the morning by a mere waste of words. From a business stand-point the mode of existence led by Ministers of the Crown was not a wise one. In the case of a partner they would not regard that as a condition of life which was good for his health, which could not last under the strain. If in a private business the partners led such a life it would not be regarded as a very wise proceeding. The heads of the State were the partners of the country, and they would not be wise in allowing such a condition of affairs as now existed. The remedy for this evil, no doubt, in the first place, lay with the constituents of hon. Members, who could say to their Members, "You talk too much and waste the time of the country. If you have anything to say, say it in the fewest possible words." The remedy was with the country, but he also thought Ministers might move in the matter, because he was sure the country would support any step, in reason, which the Government took to stop this waste of words, which in this House was a seriously increasing evil. That this was so was proved by the fact that the great newspapers were ceasing to report the debates of the House because they found that the public did not read them. The public were tired and weary of so much talk, and any suggestion put forward by Ministers to remedy the evil would have the full approval of the country. Ministers could limit the opportunity for talking; they could limit the session, and they could make the Twelve o'clock Rule a real Rule of the House. He would like to see it made an Eleven o'clock Rule. He did not believe any good work was done after twelve o'clock at night. The attitude of the Opposition could hardly be taken seriously, because it was common knowledge that they welcomed the proposal to closure the Education Bill even more heartily than those who supported the Government, for the reason that they knew that in this House they could not support the statements they had made on public platforms, and because they could not bring up Members in any force to oppose the Closure. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would of course go to the country and complain of this procedure, and therefore it was desirable to bring out these facts before the session terminated in order that their constituencies should be able to judge of the value of the complaints hon. Gentlemen opposite would make.

(6.20) **Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE** (Carnarvon Boroughs): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has suggested many subjects for discussion which may be very instructive, but which are hardly relevant to the Question before the House. I think the hon. Gentleman is the only Member in the House who has suggested that in our opposition to this Bill there had been—he said he would not call it obstruction or an abuse of the Rules of this House, but simply a waste of words. The Prime Minister, who is perhaps a better judge of obstruction than the hon. Gentleman, said he would not put it on the ground of obstruction at all. It is very remarkable that in a Resolution of this kind, which suggests the termination of a debate by violent means, there has been, in the arguments in support of it, no charge at all of deliberate obstruction in the discussion of the Bill. A good deal has been said about the working of Parliament and its methods of working, and the hon. Member for the Partick Division of Lanark made some comparison with America, but in America difficulties of this sort have been met by referring local matters to local bodies, and when the hon. Member quotes America, I should like to know whether he is prepared to adopt the same practice of the devolution of local matters. So far as Wales is concerned, it has regularly voted by a majority of four to one against this Bill, and what a difference it would have made in the progress of this Bill if the Welshmen had been left to settle it. The Government is forcing on different parts of the country measures which may or may not be applicable to England but which are certainly not applicable to Wales, and which they do not want, and that is the reason why they have got into this difficulty. The remedy for such a state of things as now exists is not violence, but the devolution of domestic matters to local Parliaments.

On the ground of congestion I do not contend that the Government are not within their rights in proposing such a Resolution as this before the House. I have voted for such a Resolution once or twice, and I may have the honour to vote for one again, but the precedents quoted by the Prime Minister are not applicable to this case. The right hon. Gentleman quoted the Crimes Act, the Home Rule Bill, and the Evicted Tenants Bill. In two of those Bills there was the element of urgency, and there was a mandate for Home Rule. But will the Prime Minister say that this Parliament has been elected on the basis of sectarian education? That is the real difference. Or, take the case of urgency. Is the Education Bill a case of urgency like the Crimes Act? The conditions underlying the Education Bill have been in existence for years and years. The Prime Minister introduced a Bill in 1896 and dropped it; in 1899 he introduced another to deal with the same question and dropped it; he introduced another in 1900. It is only after six years that the Prime Minister has suddenly found out that this is an urgent problem, to be dealt with in a certain way. I think the case against the Resolution is that which the Colonial Secretary made against a similar Resolution in 1893, that the Government were dealing with a problem in a way for which the country had given no mandate. The Colonial Secretary could not say that there was no mandate to deal with Home Rule; all that he could say was that the Government of that time had no mandate to deal with the details of the Bill in the way they proposed. But in respect of the Education Bill it is a case of principle which has never been placed before the country. I shall be curious to hear the Colonial Secretary explain why in 1893 he considered it to be a case of wrecking the liberties of debate and degrading Parliament, while now he is supporting a Resolution as to a Bill which was not even hinted at in the election which was sprung on the country in 1900. The Government then had a majority of 132,000 votes in the country — that was the total majority of the votes registered. The right hon. Gentleman said thousands and thousands of voters in a district in the North, Liberals and Radicals, not giving up their principles, were voting on one issue, and one issue alone, and according to the right hon. Gentleman that was the War. Having obtained their votes, having gone to the Midlands and said "You can venture as Liberals and Radicals to vote because there is no issue except the War," the Colonial Secretary now utilises votes obtained on other pretences to press through by Closure, by suppression of debate, a measure which he knows perfectly well not one of the thousands he appealed to ever gave a vote in support of. It has been said that England has voted by two to one in the House in favour of the Bill. I ask hon. Members opposite, will they venture to say, even the hon. Member for Central Bradford, the successor of Mr. Forster—("What a falling off was there!")—that two to one of the electors in England were in favour of this Bill?

MR. WANKLYN: In the recent municipal elections in Bradford twelve

Conservatives supporting the Bill were returned, as against five Radicals against it. The chairman of the Liberal Party came out on this Bill, and was thrown.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I think the hon. Member is not correct in his information, even about his own constituency. I am informed, at any rate on the authority of *The Times*—I go no higher than that—that in Bradford there was a win of two Liberal seats in the municipal contest. If there were to be a corresponding gain throughout the country, I should like to know what becomes of the huge majority that supports this Bill in the lobbies? But let us take the election addresses during the last General Election. I am not carrying the mandate principle too far. I do not say you can get an absolute mandate for every Bill you bring in, but I venture to say no important Bill, except in a case of urgency like the Crimes Act, has ever been introduced to the House, at any rate within the last thirty or forty years, without a responsible leader of the Party indicating before the General Election that he was in favour of the problem being dealt with in a certain way. What was the case in the last General Election? I have gone through the election addresses of some hon. Members. The Colonial Secretary never said a word about the education problem. His election address was full of South Africa. The Prime Minister never said a word about education, neither did the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. The hon. Member for Tunbridge Wells, another light of the Church Party, never took his constituents into his confidence, and the right hon. Member for Oxford University never informed his clerical supporters that he intended to support a rate-aided Bill. I cannot find that even the hon. Member for Central Bradford ever said that he was in favour of giving rates for the support of denominational schools.

MR. WANKLYN: I have said it since 1897.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Again, I accept the hon. Member's statement, and I say that this is not the only respect in which the hon. Member was singular. The hon. Member, then, was the pioneer of this movement. Now the House has got the real parent of the Bill in Mr. Forster's successor. With that exception I can find no election address in which there was any reference to this Bill. There was no mandate for it, and the Government never took the electors into their confidence, and every indication that has been given since shows clearly that, at all events up to the present, it is a Bill that the electors are not convinced about. Have the Government then the right to curtail discussion which has been fruitful? Hon. Members have gone to their constituents and said that the Bill has been changed for the better up to the present, but, if hon. Members acknowledge that it has been changed for the better, they have to thank the Opposition for it as the result of discussion. But just as these changes are coming they are suddenly stopped. There is to be no more discussion, there are to be no more Kenyon-Slaney Amendments—and that is the real reason. If the Government had said to the electors, "We mean to abolish School Boards and to put voluntary schools on the rates, to subsidise definite dogmatic teaching, and give a third control to the ratepayers," what would have happened? In Liverpool, it would have been "Vote for the Low Church." Suppose there had been a placard in Birmingham, "Vote for Collins and the Catechism," "Vote for the Colonial Secretary and true religion," how would Birmingham have regarded it? Even now the fate, not merely of the Ministry, but of the Empire, depends on this Bill. The Colonial Secretary has told his constituents, "If you do not get this Bill through, well, I will have to go, and there is an end of the British Empire." Of course, the right hon. Gentleman's constituents all believe that he is the very linchpin of the British Empire. But what did they do? They passed a series of five resolutions—I do not know that any one of them has yet been embodied in the Bill. At any rate, there was severe condemnation of this Bill. There was no mandate even from Birmingham for this Bill. The hon. Member for Central Bradford said, "Let us look at this as a business transaction." Let me take a similar view of it. Take, if you like, a prospectus. You want money to develop a business in Africa; you go to the subscribers and get your money. Having got it, instead of using it for the African business, you use it to set up an opposition business next door to your African business. I do not know what business men would call such a transaction, but I know what the law would say. It would say it was obtaining money by false pretences and a fraudulent transaction. The Government have not treated this question fairly. They have brought in this Bill to put Christianity on the rates, for which they have no mandate. There has been a good deal of pressure brought to bear on the Government, and that is the real history of this Bill. There is not an hon. Member on either side of the House who ever dreamt of this Bill in 1900. If they dreamt about it, it was grossly unfair of them not to tell their constitutents at the time. What happened? Petitions from the clergy came pouring in by the thousand. This is how the Bishop of Truro recommended ome of the petitions—

> "Nobody was so open to pressure as the Cabinet, and he believed that on this question the Cabinet was not united."

Then the letter says something about the Colonial Secretary—

> "It was not to be expected that men like Mr. Chamberlain, brilliant and able as they were, but who only knew the Church from the outside——"

That is rather severe on the right hon. Gentleman. But they went on to bring their pressure to bear. Thousands of petitions came pouring, in because they knew a Bill was to be tabled this year dealing with education. Afterwards they find there is an optional Clause, and they issue another circular saying—

> "You succeeded in bringing influence to bear on the Government to bring in this Bill; now use the same influence again to strike out the optional Clause."

Where did the pressure come from? Not from the constituencies, but from thousands of clergy who sent in petitions. I do not think it is fair. This is a matter which deals with millions of people in this country, and it is unfair to take one profession in the land and simply accept their dictation. The real reason for this Resolution is that suggested by the Colonial Secretary with regard to the Government of 1893. He said—

> "You are afraid of discussion, the by-elections are going against you. I ask you to show me the secret reports of your electioneering agents with regard to this Bill."

I wonder whether we dare suggest that same inquiry to him. If only the secret reports of the electioneering agents about this Bill could be tabled here, And the by-elections! The Government are afraid of going on because the pressure in the country is increasing. ["No."] What about the Cleveland Division and East Toxteth? [AN HON. MEMBER: Devonport.] Oh, Devonport? a shilling a day.

There is another reason, and that is the difficulty the Government are getting into with Amendments. They accepted an Amendment a few days ago, and what has happened? They have been violently abused in language that I cannot help deprecating. It is really too strong. This is what the *Church Times*, the organ of the High Church party, said about them:—

> "On many a point since this measure was introduced the Government has shown itself capable of mismanagement, cowardice, and even imbecility, but on Friday it fairly eclipsed all previous records."

That is the real reason—the feeling that is growing up amongst their own people. The Government are afraid of amending their own Bill. One ecclesiastic wrote the other day charging bishops with sharp practice. I do not know what the effect of dogmatic Christian teaching may be in the schools, but one thing is clear—it does not improve either tempers or manners. They call their leaders imbeciles and charge bishops with sharp practice. Really, we have never gone so far as that. It is clear that the country is against the measure [Cries of "No,"]; they never had an opportunity of considering it. The Colonial Secretary at the last election took the ratepayers by the hand and said to them, "Fix your eyes on South Africa; wicked Radical politicians will tell you to look around at your own affairs, but keep your eyes on that golden shore 6,000 miles away." They followed his advice, and while the poor man was looking ahead they robbed his orchard, destroyed some of his best fruit trees, and by this Bill the Government are distributing the fruit among the clergy at whose dictation the measure was introduced.

(6.50.) **Major Rasch** (Essex, Chelmsford): I rise to support most respectfully the contention of my right hon. friend the Member for the Sleaford Division in reference to an extension of time for the discussion of Clause 13, because although I am bound to say I think the Government are perfectly right generally in their proposal, I think they are wrong in detail in this particular matter of finance. Very few people realise how important this matter is to the agricultural interest, how deadly in earnest we are about it, and how strongly we feel on the subject. What do we care about your Cowper-Temple Clause or your Kenyon-Slaney Amendment? The importance of the Bill, so far as we are concerned, is in its financial Clauses. I would remind my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that a good deal of water has run under the bridge since he made his statement on June 24th last, and that is the reason we want a little more time to discuss Clause 13. On June 24th the proposal he made was inadequate, but very fair; it was not sufficient then, it is by no means sufficient now. You have ruled, Sir, that we cannot go into the details of the Bill on this Motion, therefore I will simply say that what was good enough for us then is not good enough now. We find that the agricultural interest is stopped from speaking on these, matters which are of the most serious importance to us—by whom? By the very people who profess to be the best friends of the agricultural interest. I am bound to say that we have no fault to find with them—they are the friends of the agricultural interest, and we have supported them as such—except in this particular matter. I have shown my gratitude, because, although I voted against the First and Second Reading of the Bill, ever since the First Lord made his speech on the financial proposals on June 24th, giving us what we thought was adequate consideration, I have voted for every Amendment of the Government, without even looking at it to see what it all was. Gratitude is very well, but we must draw the line somewhere, and with all respect to the Government, and with every desire to support them, as I have done consistently on this Bill—with the exception of the two details to which I referred just now—we draw it where we are stopped from laying before this House the fair and proper complaints of our people.

(6.55.) **Sir Brampton Gurdon** (Norfolk, N.): I need hardly assure hon. Members on the other side of the House that we shall be just as glad to get to the end of the Education Bill as they will. But if it is to be forced through the House by means of this very drastic Resolution there must be fair play. There must be no obstruction from the Government side of the House, there must be no talking against time, and if we are to proceed according to this Resolution, Members must make up their minds to come down to the House at the hour at which the Bill is appointed to be taken, and if an unimportant Motion is under discussion to dispose of it at once. I say this not in any controversial mood, but merely as an appeal to the honour of hon. Gentlemen on the other side. I ask whether it would be fair for the measure to be closured wholesale at the end of an evening, if we are not to begin punctually as soon as the House meets. I have had the curiosity to count the speakers on some of the Amendments discussed last week, and I find that on one Amendment out of eighteen speakers thirteen were on the opposite side of the House, while on another Amendment no fewer than twenty-four speakers out of twenty-six were from the same Party. I do not say that they were talking against time or obstructing; I merely mention it to show that all the speaking has not come from this side of the House. It will really be impossible to get the Bill through if every speech of five minutes on this side is followed by half a dozen of twenty minutes on the other side. The hon. Member for Central Bradford has suggested that it is open to the constituencies to tell Members that they talk too much. That is true, but they can go on telling them so, and it may be a great many years before they will be able to carry their threats into effect. I would suggest to certain Members on the other side, who shall be nameless, but who are rather given to lecturing us, a mode by which they may greatly facilitate the progress of this Bill. Remembering the old adage, "example is better than precept," I am not going to preach anything I do not myself practise. I would suggest to these hon. Members, to whom I will not more specifically refer—their own consciences will tell them who are the guilty ones—that they should not rise oftener than I do, that they should cut their speeches as short as I cut mine, and that they should try to be a little less dull. By so doing, they will give great satisfaction, not only to this side of the House, but equally to their own friends; they will give still more satisfaction to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, and they will give most satisfaction of all to the Chairman of Committees.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington): I wish to make one point with regard to a certain paragraph in the Amendment of my right hon. friend. The Amendment reads—

"... and, while assuming to establish a permanent system of national education, endows denominational teaching—"

and so on. It, in fact, charges the Government with assuming for this Bill that it establishes a permanent system of education. I venture to say that whereas, in order to obtain success for any educational system whatever you must be perfectly certain that you will be backed up by popular co-operation, this Bill is not a Bill for popular co-operation, and that you are, in fact, legislating not for a majority but for a minority of the people of the country. I have here a Blue-book published not long ago, which gives certain striking figures to which I desire to draw the attention of the Government. It states that the average attendance of all the children in the national and Church of England schools throughout the country amounts to 1,887,000. The number in average attendance at the Roman Catholic schools is 257,000. This gives a total of 2,144,000 children in average attendance at the Church of England, the national and Catholic schools. I have added these together because it is generally assumed that the Church of England and the Catholics welcome this Bill and receive it with approbation. There are in average attendance at board schools 2,239,000 children, in British schools 250,000, and in Wesleyan schools 127,000, making in all a total of 2,580,000 children whose parents have not required that there should be denominational sectarian teaching for their children. That being so, by this Bill you are legislating for a minority of the parents of the children. If you desire permanence for this Bill you are going a very curious way to obtain it, and you are forcing upon the country that which more than half of the parents of the country do not desire. I venture to say there has been abundant evidence to show that a majority of the parents are against denominational teaching, and at the recent bye-elections the verdict has been against this Bill.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): Although the Education Bill is a measure that deeply affects the welfare of the people, the representatives of the people are not to be allowed free discussion upon it. Not only have many of our Amendments been closured, but our consciences as Nonconformists, especially in the rural districts, have been stirred in a manner which has not been equalled in the lifetime of any Member of the House. At the fag end of the session we are to have this Bill rushed through by the brute force of a majority elected for other purposes, with no indication whatever that the Government ever intended to deal root and branch with the education of the country. Here we are at the end of the session with only half the Bill passed, and we are to have this brutal application of superior numbers to destroy our efforts and opportunities to impress our opinions upon the various Clauses of this measure. In a Bill which is going to deal with the future education of this country, elementary education is by far the most important part of the system, because without sound elementary education, good secondary education is almost impossible. If we had had two sessions to deal with this great subject, it would not be too much having regard to its far reaching importance. All those who have studied the industries of the world, and taken note of the enormous advance made every year by invention and chemistry in its application to industry, must know that education is the great force of the future, and that unless this country is equipped in knowledge it will suffer as it is now suffering through the competition of the more educated nations. This fact would have made the Government pause before making this reckless proposal which we are now discussing. A sound national system of education is more important to the British nation than the British Army. Efficiency in education is more important than efficiency at the War Office, and yet we are dealing with it as if tremendous issues were not involved, and the Government are proposing to cut short this discussion by using the Closure—that tremendous instrument for the destruction of representative government. We have had the School Board system growing up with brilliant success, and now the Government are proposing to supplant it with a system of Bumbledom detrimental to the interests of the people.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is not the question under debate.

Mr. BROADHURST: If I have transgressed it is through my folly in noticing remarks made by the other side. In my opinion, this is an iniquitous Motion and an outrageous Bill. We are going to be deprived of opportunities for full discussion by the brutalising application of mere numbers in the Division Lobby, and whatever may happen in consequence, all those who support this system of the destruction of popular government must be answerable for it. The Government are going to force upon an unwilling community instruction in dogmas which are repugnant to the feelings of one half of the inhabitants of the country. The schools are going to be subject to the whims of particular ministers of the Church of England in hundreds of parishes.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to make a Second Reading speech upon this Motion.

Mr. BROADHURST: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. It was only the strong personal feeling I have against this measure which led me into that particular line of argument. I protest against the application of this wholesale closure upon a matter which goes deep down into the soul of every Nonconformist in the country, especially in regard to our poorer neighbours in the rural districts, where they will not have the same opportunity of defending themselves against these aggressions as men would in the great centres of industry. I detest the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I look upon it as a monstrous measure, and I will do everything in my power that is legal to destroy the Bill. A more hateful measure to me was never introduced into the House of Commons, and this hateful process of the Closure is being applied to put an end to what is a reasonable and fair demand and almost a birthright—the right to discuss a measure of this kind so long as we discuss it within the limits of reason. We have not had sufficient time to discuss and improve the measure. We have been closured again and again, and no argument has been listened to, and now the whole thing is to be cut down, as it were at one blow, by the Government and their followers. Like the hon. Member for Central Bradford, they are ready to "execute" the public rights of the citizens of this country at the call of the Party Whip. The hon. Gentleman said "Let us go to our constituencies." I only wish that we were going next week. [Cries of "Divide."] If we did go, many hon. Members would find that their time for calling "Divide" had come to an end.

*(7.17) Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): I could not help thinking when the hon. Member for Carnarvon was speaking that while there was no one perhaps who had addressed the House more frequently and at greater length than he had, there was no one against whom the charge could be less justly brought of having wasted the time and obstructed the proceedings of the House. I have one claim to address the House from the fact that I have not spoken one moment since we reassembled after the recess. On one occasion I did attempt to speak on the refusal of the schools for the purpose of political meetings, but the Closure was moved and I had not the opportunity. Therefore my conscience is perfectly clear as to having wasted the time or obstructed the proceedings of the House. Reference has been made to the opposition to this Bill, and a comparison drawn between the proceedings now and those in regard to the Home Rule Bill of 1893. I venture to submit

that the attitude of the opponents of the Home Rule Bill was wholly different and that the analogy breaks down. There was an avowed intention to wreck the Home Rule Bill altogether, and a repudiation of any idea of improving it in any way. No charge could be less true in regard to the Education Bill. Amendment after Amendment has been moved, and in many cases accepted, and these now form part of the Bill. I venture to say that, if on three great points Amendments moved by the Opposition had been accepted—first, the Amendment which would have continued the School Boards for a time; second, one that would have given the ratepayers two-thirds of the managers instead of one third; and third, one that would have left open the field for teachers, and done away with religious tests—they would have practically removed the objections to the Bill, which might, by this time, have been very far towards completion. My right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has said that there is no possible reason or pretext for hurry, and for the bringing to a conclusion of these debates, and I perfectly agree with him, yet I think there may be, in the minds of some hon. Members opposite, a reason for wishing to come to the end of them, namely, the attractions of certain other occupations in the country. When I think of the statement of my hon. friend the Member for Durham, of how the House has been bored by interminable debate, I would remind him of the lines written by a late Member of the House who was well known, and whose son is now an honoured Member of it. Describing his experience of the House of Commons, he said—

> "Last night in St. Stephen's so wearily sitting,
> (The Member for Boreham sustained the debate)
> Some pitying spirit that round me was flitting,
> Vouchsafed a sweet vision my pain to abate."†

Then he went on to describe a very delightful run with the foxhounds as being to him the sweet vision which had entirely obscured the mace, the Speaker, and the House. I venture to think that the pleasures of the country form no little element in the desire of some hon. Members opposite to facilitate the conclusion of the debates on this Bill. We say boldly not only that the Government has no mandate for it, but that it is in direct opposition to the wishes of the country at the present moment. There is only one test by which you can judge, and upon every opportunity which the country has had of expressing an opinion, namely, by means of elections, the country has invariably pronounced against, and overwhelmingly against, the passage of the Bill. I do not think any hon. Member can look at the long list of honours published in the papers yesterday, and notice the total absence of any peerage conferred, without thinking that there was some reason for it. It is an open secret that the Government, to use a perfectly straightforward phrase, did not dare to make vacancies in seats here for fear of losing seats. If there was one seat in the country which was believed to be more overwhelmingly Conservative and secure than another it was Sevenoaks, and yet the Party opposite came very near defeat in that constituency. We are, therefore, justified in saying not only that the Bill is unpopular, but that the country would pronounce very largely against it. That is one of the strongest arguments that can be brought forward against hurrying this debate to a conclusion. Something has been said as to what the attitude of the Colonial Secretary towards the Bill has been. Over and over again in the course of the last year or two he has assured the country that there was only one issue before it. I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman is not in his place at present. In connection with the election which took place at Dewsbury in January last, the right hon. Gentleman sent the following message in favour of the Unionist candidate:—

> "Tell Mr. Haley that I am watching with great interest the gallant fight that he is making, and wish to remind the electors of the Dewsbury Parliamentary Borough that in this election patriotism comes before partisanship, and that this is no contest between Liberals and Conservatives, that there are only two parties—those who are for their country, and those who are for the Boers."

Nothing could be more direct than that definition as to what the question was. I have only to say that this Education Bill was never before the country. I have received protest after protest against it, and I have not had a single Petition in favour of it so far as I remember. I am confident that, if my constituency were appealed to tomorrow it would give me a larger majority than I had on the last occasion.

---

† The late Mr. Bromley Davenport's lines, entitled "The dream of the old Meltonian."

*MR. PRIESTLEY (Grantham): I think that possibly, though a comparatively new Member of this House, there is some justification for my offering a very brief, but very emphatic, protest against what I myself consider the unconstitutional and unnecessary proposals of the First Lord. I do not wish to display any presumption in this antagonism, but I hope that even as a young Member of the House I have as great a desire for the true welfare of Parliamentary debate as more experienced Members, or the Leader of the House. I think these proposals are not only unfair to the country, but impolitic from the highest point of view. In reading the great debates of past times we have, I think, always recognised the inestimable value of freedom of debate, and if a subject does not bear examination by free debate, you may depend upon it that there is something radically wrong. The question of education which we are now discussing is possibly the greatest we can discuss in this House. If the Government had received a mandate from the country to deal with the question, or if the Bill had been submitted in any shape or form for the consideration of the country, there might be some justification, after a reasonable time had been given for discussion, for closuring debate, but I think we may say without hesitation that the subject is one of far greater importance than the debates in the House would lead one to suppose. It seems to me that great issues have been at stake in connection with this education question. It is a question which will affect the future prosperity of millions of the people of this country; and when I hear more or less quibbling over small differences, it seems almost sad that this Parliament, which is the first in the world, should not avail itself of the opportunity which is now presented of dealing with the question in a more heroic manner than by wrangling over the question of religious instruction in our schools. I think the Party in Opposition are perfectly justified in saying that before the First Lord submitted proposals for crippling and practically destroying legitimate debate he ought at least to have submitted in some shape or form the question to the country.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [this day], "That the Proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill (including Proceedings on the Financial Resolution relating thereto), shall, unless previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion at the times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned: (*a*) The Proceedings in Committee on the remaining part of Clause 12, and on Clause 13, on Wednesday, 12th November; (*b*) The Proceedings on Clauses 14, 15, 16, and 17, on Thursday, 13th November; (*c*) The Proceedings on Clauses 18, 19, and 20, and on the Committee Stage of the Financial Resolution, on Friday, 14th November; (*d*) The Proceedings on Report of the Financial Resolution, and on the New Clause relating to the aid grant, on Monday, 17th November; (*e*) The Proceedings on the New Clauses relating to endowments, local authority's managers, and grouping, on Tuesday, 18th November; (*f*) The Proceedings on the New Clause relating to managers, and any other Government New Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other Proceedings necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion, on Thursday, 20th November; (*g*) The Consideration of the Report shall be appointed for Tuesday, 25th November; and the Proceedings on Report on any New Clauses and on Amendments to Parts I. and II. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on that day; (*h*) The Proceedings on Report on Amendments to Part III. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on Thursday, 27th November; (*i*) The Proceedings on the Report of the Bill shall be concluded on Friday, 28th November.

"At 11 P.M. on the said days, or, if the day is a Friday, at 4.30 P.M., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business.

"In the case of new Clauses and Schedules, he shall put only the Question that such Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill.

"Proceedings under this Order shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 P.M.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

"After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Education (England and Wales) Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order 17, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith.

"If Progress be reported the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent Sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'this House declines to entertain a proposal to restrict debate upon a measure which, since it vitally affects the whole working of local government and administration, and, while assuming to establish a permanent system of national education, endows denominational teaching out of the rates without securing full popular control, demands the most searching examination in every particular.' "—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words to the end of line 6, stand part of the Question."

*(9.0.) MR. PRIESTLEY: At the interruption of the sitting I was addressing my remarks to an aspect of this question which I regard as of great importance. The debates so far as they have gone, the right hon. Gentleman will admit, have had a beneficial effect upon this Bill. Many of the Amendments have come from his own supporters and many from hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, and it is universally admitted that those Amendments in the main have improved the character of the Bill. Realising the vast importance of this Bill for twenty-five or thirty years to come, the effect it will have on generations; the enormous results it will have, beneficially or the reverse, is it unreasonable to have expected that the debate upon the system, for the purpose of benefiting the Bill, should have continued. I will ask in all fairness, supposing for the sake of argument the period required for thoroughly and efficiently discussing this measure was another six months. Why should we not spend that amount of time on it? Is it not our duty here to give our ability, energy, and time to the most thorough and capable discussion of this measure? Even if six months further time were required, we should, I think, have persevered until we had passed and placed upon the Statute-book the best edition of the measure the First Lord of the Treasury has introduced. Another reason I would advance for further discussion on this Bill, if the House would see its way to reject the Resolution and reject the Closure by compartments, is that this Bill is couched in extremely vague phraseology. It requires an expert to make common sense out of some parts of the Bill, and in the interests of the Bill itself, more time ought to be given to its discussion. I, like many other Members, am personally interested in a part of this Bill, which interest will be seriously affected by those proposals if they are allowed to influence our discussions. I had the honour to introduce an Amendment last session relating to a branch of education which many of us regard as of great importance; an Amendment for the purpose of introducing into our national education the system of physical culture. The First Lord sympathised with my views on that question. I think his words were that he followed, with interest and with feelings of entire agreement, the views I expressed, and it is naturally rather irritating to find that there is no opportunity of introducing this matter into this Bill by way of a new Clause which has been put down, and which now there will be no opportunity of bringing

forward. That is one subject which the First Lord admitted was possibly at least as important as any other branch of education. I only use that as an illustration of the result of this unstatesmanlike manner of cutting short the discussion of a measure which will become law and affect the interest of education in this country for a considerable period. It is not, I trust, too late to hope that when this Bill has passed this House it may be dealt with in another place, and if that other place justifies its existence there is not the slightest doubt that it will consider the manner in which this Bill has been dealt with in this House is unconstitutional, and its authority and its power will be used for the purpose of rejecting it, and thus compel the Government to go to the country upon this question.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.): Many who have listened to the course of this debate will admit that the reasons urged against this Motion by the Opposition are extremely thin. One reason given, however, is worthy of consideration. They say a Motion of this sort would put a great amount of power into the hands of the executive Government to curtail freedom of debate. But, Sir, hon. Gentlemen opposite are, to a large extent, disqualified from arguing that reason, owing to the occasions similar to this on which they found it necessary to take just such another step. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down referred to an Amendment in which he was interested, and which will be cut out from discussion owing to the operation of this Resolution. But such a point as that might be met on the present occasion by arrangement, and it could be met on a future occasion by a very slight alteration in our procedure. That is to say, when you are allotting time, one day for this Clause and another day for that, so as to make the best of the time, and distribute discussion so far as possible over the different parts of the Bill, it would be possible to distribute the time on those days among various Amendments, giving preference to those which were of most importance. That could be done by a very slight alteration in the powers under the Standing Order. But with regard to those who complain that their Amendments will be cut out, after all, the Opposition have the matter very much in their own hands, because the Government Amendments will take up very little time, and if the Opposition choose to consult among themselves and settle which Amendments they think are of primary importance, and see that those Amendments are brought forward in due course, there will be no difficulty in discussing them within the allotted time. The reasons upon which this Motion is resisted are very shortly put in the Notice Paper, and I see there are no less than seven Amendments which put in the forefront of their wording, "That the proposal of the Government is calculated to disgrace the House to the level of a voting machine." I venture to think this House must either be a voting machine, a talking machine, or a working machine. It has to be something of a talking machine and something of a voting machine, but it is most important that it should be a working machine, and that is why Motions of this kind become at times necessary. We should stultify ourselves if we allowed ourselves to be overcome with our own verbosity. When we look at what is left of this Bill we see that it does not involve any questions of policy, but questions which might be discussed by a Standing Committee of this House in far less time than has been allotted by this Resolution. The Leader of the Opposition put forth as a reason for his Amendment the fact that this Bill endows denominational teaching. If one followed that up it would lead to a Second Reading debate. But I may point out to the House that the part that endows denominational teaching has already been passed, and everything that could be urged with regard to that has been urged in this House. What is left of the Bill? Clause 12 we have nearly got through, Clause 13 is simply a question of expenditure, Clause 14 relates to borrowing, Clause 15 to arrangements between the local authorities and councils, Clause 16 to Provisional Orders, and Clause 17 to overlapping, Clause 18 to the definition. So I say that if we had not the religious element in this, these are matters which would be dealt with in far less time by a Standing Committee than that allotted. We ought to look at this Motion from the point of view of getting through our business. We ought, of course, to look jealously upon any suggestion of the Executive Government to curtail the freedom of discussion; but when we find ample time allotted under the Resolution—time in excess of what would be required by a Standing Committee—I think the Government is doing the right thing, and that the country will think the same.

*(9.15.) SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire W.R., Rotherham): I have not hitherto taken any great part in the debate on this Bill, yet if I had followed the evident wishes of my constituents, I should have been speaking every day and several times a day, so strong is the interest they take in the measure. Nor can we be surprised when we consider that the subject is one of paramount importance. I cordially support the Amendment moved this afternoon by my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. I think it is quite evident from the speeches already delivered, that this subject is of paramount importance. The proposals before the House are revolutionary in their character, and are fraught with momentous consequences to the welfare of our race. A false step taken now can only be retraced later on slowly and perhaps painfully, and therefore it follows that exactly in proportion as the Bill is important, and that a wise decision should be arrived at, so exactly in the same proportion is there need at the present time for the most careful and critical discussion of its provisions. We must all feel that it is a very unfortunate circumstance that the religious question should have had so much prominence given to it, but the fault of that does not rest with this side of the House, but rather at the door of the Government. I hold that no greater dis-service could be done to the Church of England than to persist with the Bill in its present form; and I know that many members of that Church fully recognise that some of the proposals of the Bill are very unjust in their nature. I have received unsolicited communications to that effect from clergymen of the Church of England, who see that so long as this injustice is allowed to remain, so long will there be hostile influence at work in their respective localities. Rightly or wrongly, the people have got it into their heads that the clergy are somehow pulling the wires of this Bill, that they have exerted their influence on the Government, and have taken an unfair advantage of the great majority which the Government obtained for a very different purpose. It has fallen to my lot to address a large number of meetings in different parts of the country, and, so far as I have been able to feel the pulse of those meetings, the people resent the idea of any Church putting their hands into the public purse without first obtaining the consent of the public at large who own that purse. There is no precedent for the action of the Government in attempting to force, by means of the Closure, through the House of Commons such a stupendous proposal as that we are now considering, not only without any pretence of a mandate from the country, but even in direct opposition to the wishes of the people in so far as we can interpret those wishes by recent by-elections. The volume of opposition to the Bill is very much greater than would appear from some of the newspapers. There was, for instance, that memorable Conference which took place in Birmingham, and which is destined to become historical. On that occasion there was a great speech by the Colonial Secretary which was of course fully reported; but there were a great many other speeches delivered on the same occasion not one of which was reported, so that we do not know the full extent of the hostility then manifested to the Bill. It would be bad enough on the part of the Government to persist with this Bill when they know that the country is against them; but if the Bill be a good Bill there is nothing to be lost by letting the light of day into its provisions, and by having the fullest and most complete debate in this House. When the country sees the Closure applied in so ruthless a manner by the Prime Minister, and that coercion instead of argument is used to drive the Bill through the House, the opposition of the country will become greatly embittered. The use of the Closure will disincline the public from receiving this Bill with that measure of approval which we are anxious to see given to all Bills which pass this House. Our laws are only strong if they have the respect of those who are to obey them, and if

they are felt to be fair in their incidence, and administered in an impartial manner. But all these qualities will be lacking in the present Bill should it become an Act of Parliament. I know the Government take their stand on the Church on the one hand, and the Constitution on the other; but I venture to submit that they are not displaying a very constitutional spirit when they muzzle Parliament and defy the express wishes of the electors. It is true that the Government have made many changes in the measure, but these have been made under the stress of the debate, and are, for the most part, *pro tanto*, improvements; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that further improvements would have been made on the Bill if the Closure had not ruthlessly stopped debate. How often has it happened that discussion on one question has been burked on the ground that it could more properly take place on a later Clause; but when that Clause was reached nothing but the Closure awaited the House. In that way various questions which ought to have been dealt with by the House have not received any consideration at all. I hold it is even more necessary that there should be a careful debate of the Education Bill than of the Home Rule Bill in 1893. I say this because on that occasion the then Opposition were able to rely on the House of Lords when the Bill was sent to them. In regard to this paticular measure the Liberals cannot rely on the House of Lords, because we know that when the Tories are in power there is practically only one legislative Assembly. We know that on the other side of the House hon. Members constantly claim that they have an unusual share of patriotism; and yet in this matter of education they have not patriotism enough to put before the country a truly national system of education, such as we on this side have continually advocated, both in this House and on the platform outside. I heartily support the Amendment, which I trust will meet with a large measure of acceptance.

*MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I should not on this occasion have risen to address the House were it not that I consider the issues upon which the House is called upon now to pronounce have scarcely been touched by the various speakers opposite. We are not now debating the merits or demerits of the Education Bill. What the House of Commons has to decide this evening is whether the majority of this House is to prevail over the minority. [Opposition Cries of "Oh, oh."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to me rather to ridicule, or to dissent from that doctrine; but I would venture to lay it down as a universal rule wholly without application to any particular measure, whether Home Rule, Education, the Ballot, Manhood Suffrage, or One-man-one-vote. If the opinion of the House of Commons—as it has unquestionably been in this instance—has been pronounced overwhelmingly by constant, almost growing majorities, then I say if that opinion is not to prevail in Parliamentary Government, there is an end to the House of Commons. I am aware that hon. Members opposite seem to think that they have a monopoly of purity of motive. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."] I am justified in saying that, because speaker after speaker has got up to declare that my friends on this side of the House are not obeying their conscientious convictions; that they are obeying the Party Whip, to carry out the illustration of the hon. Member who has just sat down. During the ten years I have been here I have never thought to impute motives of any kind. There is an end to what is called freedom of debate if we do not, on each side of the House, take for granted that the view which every Member for the time being expresses is that which he conscientiously believes; and therefore, when a majority of this House has over and over again expressed itself in favour of a particular issue that has to be decided, I say it does not lie in the mouths of any right hon. or hon. Member to resist unduly and illegitimately the distinctly pronounced opinion of the overwhelming majority of the House of Commons. When the hon. Member for Rotherham said that this Bill had been closured by what he called brute force, let me say that there is no argument in that. I followed attentively these debates during both the Summer and the Autumn Sessions, and without impunging in the slightest degree the purity of the motives of hon. Gentlemen opposite, I say that most of the speeches were repetitions of the argument which several Members had already advanced in behalf of the view placed before the House at the time. With all possible respect I venture to lay it down as a matter of incontrovertible fact that it does not lie in the mouth of any Member to say that issues which have been debated almost *ad nauseam* are stopped by brute force when we closure a particular issue, and ask the House to apply itself to the next Amendment. I have the honour to represent a constituency where a few friends who gave me their support at the last election have told me that in consequence of this Education Bill they will not be able to do so next time. Nevertheless, from not one of these do I apprehend the smallest dissent when I say that when, rightly or wrongly, the large majority of the House of Commons have decided it ought after reasonable debate to be allowed to pass, that this Bill is a right, a proper, and a beneficent Bill. We have to consider and decide whether the House of Commons is to act up to the traditions which have always resulted in free debate. If we come to a wrong conclusion, the nation has its remedy at the next election. Speaking for myself, I have not the least apprehension that the opinion of the nation, when it comes to know more about this Bill, when it has had its experience of it as an Act, will differ from that of the majority of the representatives.

*(9.35.) MR. T. M. HEALY: The First Lord in his adroit speech appealed to hon. Gentlemen on the left hand of the Speaker to remember that the time might come when they might be on the right of the Speaker, and to hon. Gentlemen on the right of the Speaker that the time might come when they would be on the left. That appeal cannot touch any man on the Irish Benches, for we are here permanently anchored on your left, Mr. Speaker, and, therefore, no such argument could have any force or weight with us. I am inclined to think that there is not much to be said for the precedents which have been employed by the Prime Minister for closuring the debate by compartments. They are all bad precedents, for they are all Irish precedents. This, therefore, is an epoch making occasion, because it is the first time that an English Bill, in the discussion of which English Members have mainly taken part, has been treated by the method of summary closure. Accordingly, in these circumstances, I experience between the two contending parties what the ancient theologians used to describe as a "morose delectation." When I entered the House and heard the First Lord make his speech I really thought that instead of advancing the Education Bill he was arguing in favour of a Home Rule Bill for the nature of his speech—and a most conciliatory and statesmanlike speech it was,—was an argument to prove that this House is absolutely incapable in its present condition of dealing with any first-class measure according to the ordinary Rules of Debate. And I coupled the right hon. Gentleman's arguments with a passage from his speech at the Lord Mayor's banquet last night, in which he said:

> "I anticipate no insuperable difficulties in introducing into the whole British Empire that happy spirit of liberty and of patriotism which now so eminently distinguishes Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and our other great dependencies.'

I thought to myself if that spirit of liberty and patriotism which prevailed in these portions of the British Empire is, in his view, to be extended all over the Empire, that really Ireland is, as I understand, a portion of the British Empire; and I began to wonder whether, out of the effects of the Mansion House banquet, and the promise of the extension of the liberty and patriotism which Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the Cape enjoy, the right hon. Gentleman was bent on conferring the benefits of Home Rule for Ireland.

However, I have not come across the Channel for the purpose of making any *ad captandem* argument. I simply rise to state why I am here, for the purpose of taking part in the division tonight in support of the Government, and I am sorry that there are only a few Irish Members, Catholic or Protestant, present with me. I am neither a clerical nor an anti-clerical; I am a Catholic, and in this Bill, almost for the first time, I see some chance of applying the conditions of liberality and toleration to the schools which have been erected by the poorest of the poor amongst my exiled countrymen, driveuneducated out of their own land. But with that love for education which distinguishes their race, they have, unaided by State grants, erected, mostly in your slums, these poor, wretched institutions which they call schools, but which to them represent primary, intermediate and university education. I deplore, when the cause of these schools has been put in jeopardy, the absence of so many of my colleagues on an occasion such as this. Let it not be suggested for one moment that we are not alive to the case which has been put by the Nonconformists, and by the Liberal Party, in regard to Church schools. I believe that so far as the Nonconformists of England are concerned, it is a misnomer to call them secularists. I believe they are as anxious as we are for religious education, but they are afraid lest, under the conditions which exist, as they are in a minority, proselytism should prevail if they send their children to State schools or Church schools, where religion is taught. The Catholics have, in order to preserve the religion of their children, erected separate schools, and the Nonconformists, with the same object of keeping intact the creed of their youth, want to drive out of the State schools any religion at all. Our modes are different, but our object is the same, viz., to preserve the religion of our forefathers; and let it not for a moment be supposed that we believe that the Nonconformists of England are in any degree slack or sluggish on such an issue. No, we believe that if they were in a majority they would act exactly as the Churchmen are doing to-day. [OPPOSITION cries of "No!"] But because they are in a minority they have had to invent a great principle—viz., the principle of secular education. For my part I do not pretend to understand the tenets of the Protestant denominations. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers]. Well it really would be hard to expect that in addition to the other plagues which Martin Luther inflicted on the world, that we should be compelled to study Protestantism. All I maintain is this, that the Church people, having a majority, are anxious to have religion taught in the schools, and the Nonconformists, being in a minority, and believing that the Church religion would be taught in the schools, are anxious only on that ground to exclude religion from the schools. I do not believe that that is a secularist attitude, although it is so represented in Ireland; and from my experience of this House my opinion is that with the extension of the franchise the tone of the House in its treatment of religious questions instead of becoming lighter has become graver, and, I believe there is a deeper and more growing sense of religion extending throughout England than that which existed when I first knew this Parliament. Well, it is said that the Government do not venture to take up boldly, according to some of their organs, the necessity for religious education. I feel under no such disability whatever. I believe that the whole reason for these anarchist movements which have disturbed Europe and which have led to the assassination of the Presidents of the United States and the French Republic, have been due to the expulsion of God from the schools. I believe that the Government are doing a wise and a politic thing in insisting upon the right of the parent to have his children brought up in the religion of his fathers. When I was a boy I used to be taught that the reason for the prosperity of England was due entirely to the way in which the people of England honoured the Lord's Day. That was the teaching amongst us Catholics; and we were taught that although the English people were Protestants they had a blessing of that kind. Well, Sir, in Ireland at this moment we are watching this movement in favour of religious education in this country with deep emotion and pondering hearts. Some people allege that there is some bargain between us and the Government because a handful of Irishmen are going to vote with them tonight. If there were any bargain to be made I venture to say these Benches would not be so empty as they are. The Government do not want the handful of votes that we can give them; and my vote is given simply to testify to my own opinion and judgment that the Government are engaged upon a holy and righteous cause.

Sir, it is said that the present Government are a Coercion Government, and that, as such, no Irish Member should be found in the Lobby associated with them. They will be just as much a Coercion Government next year when they bring in the Irish Land Bill, and if it be no disgrace for us to support them next year in regard to land purchase it is certainly no disgrace to us this year to support them on the question of religious education. We are told, of course, that thereby we are alienating the Liberal Party. I wish for myself to thank all the Liberals to whom I am personally known for the kind and courteous attitude which they have always shown to myself; but I wish to say that, if by voting against religious education I could purchase Home Rule, I would not be prepared, even for the liberties of my country, to sacrifice the chances of salvation of the humblest Irish exile child. Sir, the Liberal Party are in a position of great difficulty. They have Lord Rosebery on their flank. We have had experience of him; and he is a nice man to go tiger hunting with. I would go tiger hunting with him as far as the Zoo, but, as the lawyers say, "not further or otherwise." He praised this Bill at one time, and when he thought he saw the constituencies of England going against him he ate his own words, as he ate them on Home Rule, and determined that this Bill should be fought to the death. [Cries of "Question, question."]

*MR. SPEAKER: I must say the hon. Member is getting very wide of the question. I allowed him considerable latitude; because I understood he was explaining his reasons for giving the vote which he proposes to give, but he is now going too far.

*MR. T. M. HEALY: I appreciate the narrowness of the discussion, and I will endeavour, Sir, to keep within your ruling. However, I do not desire to detain the House. [Cries of "Go on."] We may be told, of course, that in supporting the Closure, the Irish Members are setting an evil precedent for themselves. But the closure has ceased to have any terrors for us. You have closured everything we care about. An hon. Member referred earlier in the debate to the fact that formerly there was a very effective method of Closure—which he called, I think, "vocal closure"—before the compartmental method had been invented. What is the result of the change? We have gained nearly everything for which you tried to shout us down, and you have practically lost the freedom of your Parliament. All the measures which from 1874 to 1884 we used to be shouted down for advocating in this House—franchise, rent questions, local government questions, abolition of grand jury questions—in spite of all the shouting down they have now found places on the Statute Book. Practically the only matter which now interests us besides education—because the land question is going to be settled—and which remains to be settled, is the question of Home Rule itself. Therefore, so far as closure of debate is concerned, I say it has ceased to have any terrors for us, because, whenever you want to Closure us, you have no hesitation whatever in doing so. I am rather surprised that amongst the list of precedents given by the Prime Minister today he did not mention the action of Mr. Stansfield on July 2nd, 1888. The Government had a little Bill affecting Ireland called the Ulster Canal Bill. It transferred the Treasury charges of protecting the Ulster Canal to a Belfast company, and a few of us in this House opposed it. It was referred to a Select Committee, and when it came down on Report we put down some Amendments to it. Instead of allowing us to discuss the Report stage of that measure, which had never been debated in the House at all, after a long discussion on other private Bills, Mr. Stansfield got up and moved—

> "That inasmuch as this Bill has been fully considered by a Select Committee, this House declines to entertain the Amendments, which ought to have been brought before the Select Committee, and that the Bill be ordered to be read a third time."

So that with regard to a local, petty Irish Bill affecting a canal, this House at the instance of a leading Liberal, did not hesitate to deprive us of a humble opportunity during Private Business to discuss the details and Clauses of that measure.

Now, Sir, is it to be said that we are so much concerned in liberty of debate that when the Government propose to give us an opportunity, for the first time, of giving a really effectual vote on a subject on which we have seriously set our hearts and souls, we are, owing to this bugbear of Closure, to withhold our support from them? I tried to inquire, before I made up my mind on the Closure question, how long, according to the ordinary methods of procedure, it would occupy if this Bill were allowed to continue its normal course, and I was informed by a very expert Liberal that it would take until March next. Is it to be said, looking at it even from a sublunary point of view, that with the promise to us of an Irish Land Bill as the capital measure of next session, as this Bill could not be finished until March next, and as there would then be necessary a recess between the two sessions, so that we could not possibly begin the next session before May or June—that our situation is so independent that we can afford to withhold support from the Government that is going to bring forward this Land Bill? I am very sorry myself to have to separate myself from those — especially my Welsh friends— with whom I usually act in this House; but it is perhaps not unworthy of consideration that it is really by their ingenuity, to a very great extent, that the present embarrassing position of affairs in regard to this Bill has been brought about. I gather that though the religion of the Welsh people, owing to the position of strength which the Nonconformists occupy on the County Councils of Wales, is not in the least danger; yet so strong is the feeling of affiliation between Welsh Nonconformists and their English brethren, that they have felt bound to give to their Nonconformist brethren in England the support which they have manifested throughout the months that have passed since the introduction of this Bill. If that has been their action, if Welshmen, out of their consideration for their co-religionists in England, have felt bound to take so strong a line, they will pardon me if, not merely for my own religion, but for men of my own race and my own blood who have been hunted out of their country, I have ventured to take up as strong a position on the other side; and, therefore, will give my support to this Motion when it is put from the Chair.

(10.2.) MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Speaker, in the course of this discussion one of the speakers said that it was understood that I was to reply upon the debate. I certainly cannot accept that statement of my attitude. I do desire to take a small part in this discussion, but I shall not dignify the remarks I have to make with the name of a reply on the debate—all the more because, after all, the issue is, as the last speech has illustrated, so narrow that there is very little to reply to. It must be remembered that in this matter both the two great Parties have a past. We are both tarred with the same brush. We have both supported Closure of the most drastic kind, and we have both opposed Closure, and, accordingly, the real principle which is at stake is a principle which is generally accepted. It is true that my right hon. friend the Member for the Sleaford Division and the hon. Member for Rushcliffe are still among the faithful found. They are still prepared to argue that any restriction of debate in this House is likely to destroy its usefulness and efficiency, but they will not deny that they stand alone, and that, whatever any of us on either side of the House may have said on previous occasions, we have all been brought by the necessities of the case to a similar conclusion — namely, that, granted a sufficient emergency, closure, and drastic closure, may properly be applied; and accordingly, when we do bring forward a proposal which is undoubtedly a drastic closure, although I think myself it might be alleged against us that it is a little belated and ought to have been introduced some time ago—I admit it is a drastic form of closure—how is it met by the Leader of the Opposition? It is met by an Amendment which practically is an attempt in terms to anticipate the Third Reading of the Education Bill, and I am not in the least surprised that the hon. Gentleman who last spoke, in a speech which was undoubtedly very interesting and very weighty, and as to the sincerity of which I can assure him there is not the slightest doubt on the part of any Member of the House, who listened to him without discussing, in the abstract or as a matter of theory, whether closure is good or bad, argued at great length that the Bill from his point of view was a good Bill, and that, therefore, he was anxious to do all in his power to further its passage. We quite understand, too, that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite who think the Bill a bad Bill should do everything in their power to obstruct it.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: It is admitted that there has been no obstruction.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not using the word, for the moment at any rate, in any sense that can by any possibility offend the susceptibilities of the hon. Member for Rushcliffe. I say it is perfectly natural for hon. Gentlemen opposite to do everything in their power to prevent the Bill from passing into law. The case, therefore, which we have to consider is not, in existing circumstances, whether or not closure in itself is a thing *anathema maranatha*, which is to be on all grounds opposed, but it is rather whether it is properly applicable in the present circumstances to the present Bill, and no doubt our conclusions on that point will largely depend upon the opinion we have of the merits of the Bill. But if right hon. or hon. Gentlemen opposite had confined themselves to that, I think we might have come to a conclusion many hours ago. We might have said: "We quite appreciate your position. We should no doubt take up the same position in your place. But in the House of Commons, according to all constitutional principles, the majority must rule, and the sooner we come to a division to see on which side the majority is the better." But right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite have not been content with that. They have sought to distinguish and differentiate. They have sought to show that, while it was perfectly reasonable and proper, and in accordance with the liberties of debate and all the other principles which we all at times attempt to enforce, that the Home Rule Bill should be rudely closured when it was only partly discussed, that that is no reason at all why this Bill should be closured after a very much longer period has been given to its discussion than was given to the discussion of the Home Rule Bill. I propose, therefore, to meet them as briefly as I can upon their own ground. It is said that the character of the opposition to the two Bills must be taken into account, and that it was very different. In this case the Leader of the Opposition said the Leader of the House insisted that there had not been any obstruction. My right hon. friend did not say so. What my right hon. friend said was that he put this upon the merits of a different issue altogether, and that it was quite unnecessary for him, in the circumstances, even to consider the question whether there had been obstruction or not. As far as my experience goes, whichever Party is in power always asserts that its Bills are obstructed—and probably they are. For my part, I do not sympathise with the sensitiveness of hon. Gentlemen opposite on this point. I will make them a present of the admission that I have myself obstructed Bills which I thought to be dangerous or obnoxious in one form or another. As long as the Rules of this House permit of obstruction, so long, in my opinion, both Parties alike will be justified in employing it. Whether we, in the interests of Parliamentary discussion, in the interests of the honour and dignity of the House, should allow these opportunities, should extend and develop them, is another question altogether. But, so long as they exist, I am quite certain they will be employed. Obstruction is a word which, perhaps it is difficult to define, and certainly in what I am going to say I am not going to use the word with any offensive intention or in any sense in which I would not be perfectly ready to have it applied to myself. I will take a point. I saw in *The Times* newspaper the other day a letter from the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Somerset who sits on the opposite side of this House. In that letter he says—

> "Liberal Members have been called to account by their Whips for not being in attendance to oppose the Bill word by word and line by line."

I should like to know what is his definition of a policy which involves opposing a Bill which must have some good qualities, which has, as in this case, good qualities that have been universally admitted, word by word and line by line. Whether the opposition t this Bill is due to the instructions of the Liberal Whips, of course—

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: These words were never used.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: They are used.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: By an individual Member. That is his interpretation.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Of course, it is open to the Leader of the Opposition to repudiate any of his followers. Surely it is open to me to quote these words *quantum valeat* as evidence of what has been developed in the sight of the whole country. I began by saying, when the Leader of the Opposition interrupted me, that whether these instructions were given by the Whips or not I, of course, could have no knowledge other than this which appears in this letter, but, whether they gave those instructions or not, it is certain that that policy has been followed. This Bill has been disputed by a very small minority of the House of Commons, line by line and word by word. I have never known, in the whole of my experience, so many Amendments put down upon any single Bill. The number of Amendments to this Bill is, I am certain, very much more numerous than the total number of Amendments upon the Home Rule Bill—I believe probably double that number. Legislation is impossible if you smother it by too many Amendments. You say that is not obstruction. Again I ask, will you give me a definition which will exclude the particular form of opposition to which we have been subjected? In the debates upon the closure of the Home Rule Bill, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire spoke several times, and, I am bound to say, I think I agree with almost every word he uttered upon that occasion, so far, at any rate, as it was general and did not apply to the particular Bill. As I have already explained, that Bill was at least as obnoxious to me as this Bill can be to hon. Members opposite. He made this statement, which has nothing to do with any particular Bill. He said: "In the course of my observation"—and the right hon. Gentleman is now one of the oldest Members of this House, and has almost unparalleled experience—"I have found that everything that can be said on a Clause can be well said in a day." In the case of this Bill, how many days did you occupy on Clause 7, how many days did you occupy on Clause 8, how many days have you occupied on Clause 12, how many days would you occupy on all the remaining Clauses of the Bill if you had the chance? What do you say after the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, that everything that can be said can be well said in a day, what do you say of the proceedings of all the subsequent days? Were those proceedings obstructive? and if they were not obstructive, do, for goodness sake, tell us what description you would give of them. I make the comparison with the Home Rule Bill. You say that you have not been guilty of obstruction. I do not know. I should not, however, use the word guilty. The charge was not made against us by any responsible person that we obstructed the Home Rule Bill. Mr. Gladstone never made that charge in moving the Closure, and I am bound to say myself, I do not think it could have been justified. I do not remember, in the whole of my experience in the House, any lengthened debate in which there was so little repetition, not because—I am not going to take credit for any virtue I do not possess—we were not capable of repeating ourselves, if we had thought that would have advanced our purpose, but because the Bill gave us so many distinct opportunities that it really was not necessary to carry our opposition to that extent.

The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition went on to say that in his recollection never had an Opposition more single-mindedly endeavoured to improve a Bill, and then—I think very unnecessarily—he heard me smile. I admit that I am of a cheerful disposition; I daresay I do smile when something amuses me. But that should not be made a charge across the Table. I will tell the right hon. Gentleman that what caused me to smile was his use of the word "single-minded." I should have said that in my experience there never was a less single-minded Opposition. I am not referring to anything outside this Bill, but upon this Bill what has happened? I do not, of course, count the Irish Members among the Opposition. The British Opposition consists, I think, of 187 Members. I believe that in a very large proportion of the divisions, less than 100 Members have voted with the Opposition. That we know as a matter of common knowledge, but beyond that we are aware of the fact that some very important and influential members of the Opposition—probably a good many of the rank and file—do not share the views of the Leader of the Opposition with reference to this measure. [AN HON. MEMBER: How many?] With regard to that I cannot say. In order that I may tell you that, the Leader of the Opposition must be good enough to produce those secret records of the Whips to which reference has been made at an earlier period of the evening. It does not matter. You cannot get over the facts. Out of a total number on your side of, I think, 187, you can only bring up 100 to vote on ordinary divisions. [AN HON. MEMBER: What is your majority?]

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What proportion of the Government supporters have voted?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I will be happy to give the right hon. Gentleman full information, and I need not even expose the secrets of our Whips in doing so. I will simply say that the Government have brought into the Lobby on all occasions, or almost on all occasions, enough of their followers to give them a majority of almost two to one. [Cries of "More, more."] I am told that I have understated my case. I ought to have said on an average three to one. But I will not go on with that. I wish to refer to something that is more important; this parenthesis is entirely due to the intervention of the Leader of the Opposition. The interruption had for its object to show that the Party that he leads had a single mind to endeavour to improve the Bill. Does he really expect us to believe that statement? Of course he does—I am sure he does. But I think he is too credulous. I do not think that those who have been most strenuous in opposition to the Bill will say that. I will not venture to challenge the Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs, who has taken a very prominent part in these debates, whether his object has not been to destroy the Bill. I do not blame him a bit, but I say that the general object of the Amendments which have been advocated with so much iteration has been to destroy the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman says that in the Home Rule debates it was our object to destroy that Bill, whilst their object is not to destroy this Bill, but to improve it. I admit that our object was to destroy that Bill, and not to improve it, and I am not ashamed of it. It is the object of those who have taken a leading part in this business to destroy the Bill, and it is the object of the Leader of the Opposition to destroy the Government. Remember, I do not blame him, but why should he be ashamed of it? Again and again the issue which he and his friends have raised upon this Bill and upon which I, for one, would only be too happy, if other avocations permitted it, to go to the country, was this: whether or not, when the Government undertook the duty of introducing the Education Bill—with the object, as they stated, to improve education, to develop secondary education and co-ordinating education—they were bound, at the same time, to destroy the compromise of 1870, and secure advantages for the denominational schools. On that point we take one view and our opponents take another. We are closuring the debate because we take our view, and they are opposing us because they hold a different view. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the Closure on this occasion apparently was out of place because the Government had accepted many Amendments, and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division said that the acceptance of these Amendments justified the continuance of this discussion. Just let us look impartially at what this very dangerous doctrine means. We are told that if we give way to Amendments we justify further discussion, even to the utmost limits. If, on the contrary, we say "We shall have the Bill as it stands," then we shall be accused of still more serious crimes. I confess, as a member of the Government—and I should say the same if I were in opposition—that I would prefer to be hanged for the first offence than be executed for the second. I do not think it is a wise course for an opponent to taunt the Government with having accepted Amendments. But, Sir, what are those Amendments? Are they important in the eyes of the Members opposite or are they not important? If they are important, as I think they are, why does not their opposition relax? Why do they continue to be as hostile now as they were before these important Amendments were accepted?

Mr. JOHN ELLIS: We want to improve the remaining Clauses.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: They want to improve the remaining Clauses! I am glad to have that ingenuous confession. As regards the Clauses that are passed there is nothing to say. I understand that as far as those Clauses are concerned, the hon. Gentleman is entirely satisfied. Still he recognises the great concessions that he has wrung from the reluctant Prime Minister. It is only these other Clauses, which we think contain nothing of importance compared with those which have been the subject of discussion, which he thinks it will be impossible to sufficiently discuss in the short time at our disposal.

But now, Sir, again I go back to my parallel. You say that the fact that we have altered the Bill under the pressure of discussion justifies you in opposing the Closure now. What happened about the Home Rule Bill? Did we alter that Bill? Why, Sir, we absolutely reversed the principle on which it was based: in the course of our discussion we absolutely changed the whole foundation of the Bill with regard to the representation of Ireland at Westminster. We altered the whole character of the Bill, and yet we were Closured after only a few Clauses had been discussed. I am not complaining of our being closured then, but I put it to the right hon. Gentleman opposite—How, after that example, can he, who supported the closure then, have the face to say that he justifies his opposition to closure now because, forsooth, we have given him certain Amendments, most of which were proposed on this side of the House, and which were most readily accepted by the Government, not to alter the principle of the Bill, but to make the principle and intention of the Bill more clear?

Then I come to another question upon which hon. Gentlemen opposite have dwelt with great satisfaction. It appears that we have no mandate to deal with education. I was glad to find that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, and even, I think, the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs, guarded themselves a little as to this. I cannot conceive any more unconstitutional doctrine than to say that Members of this House, elected for the statutory period of its existence, or such lesser period as circumstances may render necessary.—[Opposition laughter]—yes, as circumstances may render necessary—an adverse vote tonight, for instance. I say I cannot understand that any constitutionalist should say gentlemen elected under these conditions should be debarred during the term of their representation from dealing with any subject that was brought before them. That, at all events, is the principle upon which I have supposed that the House of Commons should always act, and to deny it in any way—I do not say the right hon. Gentleman, but some hon. Members in this debate have denied it—would be to turn every representative in this House into a mere delegate, and to destroy altogether the honourable character of our representation. Sir, the right hon. Gentleman went further. He quoted me. I really cannot say how grateful I am to the right hon. Gentleman and to others, and how much I appreciate the honour they do me in always raking up my speeches and in finding paragraphs to suit their immediate purpose. He took a part in that election, I believe, and had an opportunity of putting his case as against mine; and if he thought I restricted the main issue too much he had every opportunity of widening it, and, I believe, endeavoured to do so. But I made, in the course of that election, some twenty speeches within two or three weeks, and in different speeches I devoted myself to different branches of my subject. And, as a matter of common fairness, I might ask him to take the whole as representing my views, and not a single paragraph. The point he makes is that in talking to the miners, who, I am sorry to say, were not influenced by my oratory, because they returned a Member who is a follower of the right hon. Gentleman—but in speaking to them I pointed out that many of their fellows in other districts had evidently changed their minds, and had done so because in their minds the main issue at the time was the settlement after the War. I am not certain that that is not the main issue now. But in other speeches I spoke of a great number of social reforms with which I expected and hoped the Government would have to deal, and with many of them the Government have since dealt. In any case it is perfectly absurd, as I will show, for the right hon. Gentleman—he did not do it at the time—as an afterthought, now to complain that we have no right to deal with education, because I, who was not the Prime Minister, but, speaking in my individual capacity, in a single speech out of twenty, said that the principal issue was the War. I say the right hon. Gentleman is the very last man to talk about mandates, and pretend that we have not a right to deal with the education question. Sir, we had this election, and we know what the result was. We came back here, and we presented to the House a King's Speech. And the first speech which the right hon. Gentleman made after the election was upon this King's Speech. And what did he say in the course of his remarks? He said:—

> "Then we are told that there is to be a measure for dealing with the law of education, and again there is the same charming vagueness. For myself, I am one who holds that we shall not fulfil the destiny of the nation, nor, indeed, shall we be able to maintain our position among the nations until a new spirit is breathed, not only into our system of education—primary education, secondary education, University education, technical, general, literary, and scientific education, but, what is more important, until a new spirit is breathed into the public sentiment regarding education. That being my feeling, I hope that this will be a large and sweeping measure, and the more drastic and progressive the changes it makes the more hearty support I shall give it."

Now, Sir, is it not going almost beyond the common limits of Parliamentary debate for the right hon. Gentleman, who spoke in that way immediately after the election, now, years afterwards, to say that we have no mandate?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is just what I did not say. The right hon. Gentleman has said I did not say it. I have never said that you have no mandate, or no right to introduce an Education Bill. What I said was that the fact that at the election the majority was obtained exclusively upon the War was an important factor to bear in mind when we considered what the opinion of the country was on the subject.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think that was exactly what the right hon. Gentleman said, but I will not contest his statement. But again I make a comparison. They say we fought in the last election upon the War, and that since then we have introduced other subjects. What did they fight upon in 1892? One hon. Gentleman—I forget who it was—quoted a passage from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the effect that that Parliament was essentially a Home Rule Parliament; and he seemed to think that the election of 1892 was fought in the country upon Home Rule. Nothing of the kind. The election of 1892 was fought, as we all know, upon the Newcastle programme, and the beauty of the Newcastle programme was that you could take any part you liked, and leave any part you liked. And accordingly every candidate chose that part of the Newcastle programme on which to fight which he thought was most suitable to his constituency. Consequently, in one part of the country you had a man fighting the election upon Local Option, another, in another part of the country, upon Welsh Disestablishment, and another on an Employers' Liability Bill. And there was no one, except the Irish Members, or Members who, like my right hon. friend the Member for the Montrose Burghs, took a very strong and special interest in Ireland, who made Home Rule any point in their speeches. Mr. Gladstone himself did not do so. I must explain what I mean by that. I do not mean that Mr. Gladstone did not refer to the great necessity of a delegation of power, the necessity for what he called Home Rule, but we challenged him again and again at that election in the most definite terms to say what he meant by Home Rule. We went much beyond that. We put before him at meeting after meeting two or three questions, especially as to what he intended to do with regard to the representation of the Irish in Parliament, and with regard to the financial relations between the two countries, and he refused to give us any information on either of those two important points. So that when we came into Parliament, I do not know whether any of his friends knew, but certainly as far as the Opposition were concerned, we had not the remotest idea what kind of a Bill he was going to introduce, how far it would approach what has sometimes been called the policy of national councils, or how far it would be a drastic measure such as he ultimately did introduce. Therefore, I say, there is less reason for supposing that the country gave any mandate in that case than there is in the case to which the right hon. Gentleman referred. But, says the right hon. Gentleman, "The country gave you no mandate." We do not know that until the country is appealed to. But in the case of Mr. Gladstone and the Home Rule Bill we did know. We maintained throughout those discussions what the Opposition are maintaining now. We maintained that if you had a majority, a very small one, in this House, you had no majority in the country. There was no doubt about the accuracy of our prophecy. The accuracy of your prophecy is still to be fulfilled, and when I remember what hon. Gentlemen on those Benches said before the last general election—an election which somebody said tonight was sprung upon them, when, as a matter of fact, there was hardly a speaker upon any question who did not challenge us to go to the country—that if our majority was not entirely destroyed, at all events it would be reduced to the lowest limits, I confess I am not in the slightest degree alarmed at any predictions they make now.

Then we are told that we have to consider the nature of the Bill. Yes, Sir. In the speeches which I made, and from which only a few quotations have been taken—I appeal to any one who is interested in the subject of obstruction in Parliament to read the whole of them—my contention was that when you were dealing with a great constitutional question you must proceed with greater caution than in any other case. Do hon. Members opposite pretend that this Bill compares in importance with a Bill which would have entirely altered the Constitution of the United Kingdom? Of course they may hold that opinion, but I cannot understand it. And I will say another thing. Suppose Home Rule had been carried, you would then have taken an irrevocable decision. No one can deny that if Home Rule were a sort of thing that you could try as an experiment, it would have a great many more supporters than it has at present. The one thing which weighed deeply on my mind, and, I believe, on the minds of the most consistent supporters of Home Rule, was that it was a step which was full of danger, and which, if once taken, could never be withdrawn. As to this Bill, what have you been saying? You have been saying that when you come into power, which you will do, I suppose, some time or another in this or the next generation, you will revoke all we have done. And no doubt if you are in a majority you will have the power to do so, and, therefore, a mistake now, if it is a mistake that we are making, is nothing like so serious as a mistake in the case of the Home Rule Bill. I contend, therefore, that the whole weight of argument is in favour of giving a fuller discussion to a Home Rule Bill than you would give to any Bill affecting domestic legislation.

I have already referred to what has been said about the feeling of the country. In connection with this, the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs has introduced an entirely new idea which, to my mind, is extremely interesting. He says the reason for this Closure, which he describes as sudden and unexpected, is that we are afraid of a split in our Party, and he gave as evidence of this approaching convulsion a certain meeting in Birmingham and certain language which he quoted. I do not wish to say much about the meeting at Birmingham except this—that, if it was satisfactory to hon. Gentlemen opposite, I do assure them from the bottom of my heart that it was equally gratifying and satisfactory to me. And I am told—I do not know it as a fact—that in Birmingham, where this great revolution, rebellion, mutiny, revolt, as it has been described by some of the Opposition papers, has taken place, I am shortly to receive from my friends and fellow-citizens a very exceptional welcome. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] Do you object to that? [OPPOSITION cries of "Non-political," and AN HON. MEMBER: "That is not generous."] I do not want to be ungenerous. In what way is what I say ungenerous?

MR. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury): I said it was ungenerous, and I thought it was ungenerous, when the Liberals of Birmingham who are joining in this banquet have been given to understand that it is to be non-political, that you should introduce it here.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not include the Liberals of Birmingham in what I am going to say, but what I have to say is that, as regards the Liberal Unionists and the Conservatives, who are the only people in regard to whom you profess to believe that there is revolt and dissatisfaction, I speak with confidence, and I know that I have not lost their support. That is my point. The idea that because in a great Party, on a complicated Bill, certain differences of opinion have arisen, and that we have, as we always do, in accordance with our usual practice, discussed them in a friendly manner—the idea that that is the commencement of a revolt or mutiny, or that even those who take a different view from me about that Bill are any more likely to join the Radical Party than they were before, is utterly absurd to anyone who knows the political life of Birmingham.

But the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs also finds a reason for our fear in the language which he quoted—language, as far as I followed him, of personal abuse against the Government, and against, I think, he said, the Bishop of Truro.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I quoted the *Church Times*.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I understand the point of the hon. Gentleman is that, because the *Church Times*—I do not know whether the *Church Times* is ordinarily a supporter of the Government—[OPPOSITION cries of "Yes," and some MINISTERIAL cries of "No"]—uses strong language, I think too strong language, with regard to our imbecility and other faults, we have been frightened into fits, and have therefore proposed the closuring of this debate. The hon. Member introduced there a most striking and interesting theory. He said that these personalities were connected, he thought, with dogmatic instruction. That leads up to a very interesting problem. What I am led to believe is, that if any man uses scurrilous language towards me, if he attacks my character when he should only attack my political opinions, he must have been brought up in a denominational school. I have a conclusive argument against the theory of the hon. Member. The hon. Member, according to "Dod's Parliamentary Companion," was brought up in a Church school. How, in these circumstances, can he explain the moderation and the courtesy of his language and the entire absence of any personality? The theory is ingenious, but I cannot think it will be generally accepted.

After all, the Leader of the Opposition did make one statement which was not a comparison, but a positive statement. He said—although I think it was a little inconsistent both with his own action on a similar occasion, and with the rest of his speech—that this Motion takes away power from the House of Commons. If I thought that, I should certainly oppose it, but, in my opinion, it adds to the power of the House of Commons, and without some such Motion the House of Commons is reduced to a position of impotence. I again refer to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. On a previous occasion the right hon. Member for West Monmouth said—

> "The only question in this matter is, has there been a reasonable time given, in the opinion of reasonable men, for the discussion of this Bill? In my opinion everything else in this debate is beside the question."

The right hon. Gentleman thought that twenty-eight days in Committee was a reasonable time for the Home Rule Bill. Surely, thirty-eight days in Committee is a reasonable time, in the opinion of reasonable men, for the discussion of an Education Bill. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on—

> "Is the House of Commons to be reduced to such impotence that a minority can so conduct their Opposition that no first-rate measure, if they choose to refuse it, be allowed to pass through the House of Commons in a single session? That is practically the question."

Yes, Sir, my right hon. friend, in his opening speech, pointed out—what cannot be denied — that the time taken, and to be taken, on this Bill will fill up every hour of a whole ordinary session of Parliament. If the Government of the day, with a Bill of this kind in hand, were to give up every moment of its time and not introduce any other measure of any kind, the whole time of an ordinary session would be taken up, even with the Closure; but with the time which we are about to give to this Bill it would be utterly inadequate—it would extend over more than an ordinary session. I speak to both Parties, and although I do not expect Members opposite to support the closuring of this particular Bill, I ask them on the general question, do they think that that state of things can go on? I remember years ago I wrote an article in a newspaper, in which I said:

> "Suppose on a given Bill there are 500 Amendments. Suppose the Opposition which I assumed to be 300 in number, spoke each only five minutes on each Amendment; in that case not only would they take up the ordinary time of a whole session, including the time for Supply, but a great deal more."

["Oh!"] This, of course, is given as an extreme illustration, but do not be too hasty to catch me up. Take another illustration. Suppose instead of 300 Members speaking each for five minutes you would have fifty Members speaking each for half an hour, and in this debate there are many Members who have spoken on comparatively unimportant Amendments for a great deal more than half an hour. ["No, no."] What I have to insist upon is that, if either Party chooses, in existing circumstances, they can, without the Closure, carry on any single Bill throughout the whole session. It is entirely a question of taste whether at a given time the Opposition will exercise its power or not. Is that a right position for the House of Commons to be placed in?

I will now read my last quotation, and it is a quotation from the greatest Parliamentarian that this age, or, I believe, any age, has known. This is Mr. Gladstone, who in the course of the same debate said:

> "There is besides this great question another and still greater question which lies at the very base, the root of our whole Parliamentarian system—the question whether the majority shall prevail. If the majority is not to prevail, our institutions instead of being the glory of the land will become a mockery and imposture."

Surely we all echo that statement of Mr. Gladstone's. We are a great democracy. Democracy means, of course, the power of the people; that, again, has to be interpreted as the power of the majority of the people for the time being. In an uncivilised condition of things the majority make a speedy end of the minority, and there is no more heard of them. In a civilised system we introduce representative institutions in order that the majority may be represented in Parliament, and that there they may have the power by their vote to decide that which they might have decided by brute force. We substitute the vote for brute force. That is the whole object and intention of Parliamentary institutions, and I say that we are frustrating that intention and that object of our Parliamentary institutions, and we are bringing them to naught if we do not allow the majority to prevail. I will make the admission with some regret as to the Closure in 1892, because we are obliged to deal with a particular instance instead of dealing with the subject as a whole. We believe that we shall never really restore the efficiency of Parliament until we have found some way by a general statute not applicable to a particular Party or a particular Bill, by which discussion may be brought to an end within a period which will be thought to be reasonable by reasonable men. For that purpose I have recommended a Parliamentary Committee—I should not object to see the Opposition in a majority on it—to which all Bills might, if necessary, be referred, in order that some period for reasonable discussion should be fixed. I regret that this measure does not go far enough in the urgency of the case; but, not entertaining in regard to this Bill the objections which no doubt are honestly entertained by hon. Members opposite, I certainly give my vote without the slightest hesitation in favour of the Closure after this lengthened discussion, and I say that, if we were to have permitted it to go on any longer, we should, in Mr. Gladstone's words, have made the House of Commons and our Parliamentary institutions, which, after all, whatever our political opinion may be, we all unite in venerating, a mockery and an imposture.

*(11.3.) MR. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): I think, Sir, that the House cannot help contrasting the tone of the speech in which the Prime Minister introduced this Motion, with some parts, at any rate, of that to which we have just listened. I earnestly hope—and I think it is a hope which will be shared by the great majority of the House without distinction of Party—that the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down will at any rate regret in calmer moments

that he should have referred to a farewell demonstration ["Oh"] which is about to be given [Cries of "Withdraw," and some interruption] by men of all shades and sections of political opinion—[Renewed interruption.]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman has said nothing out of order.

*MR. ASQUITH (continuing): A demonstration which, I venture to say, is a tribute, and a splendid tribute, to the catholic and generous spirit in which public life in this country is conducted—as though it had any relevancy whatsoever to the question before us.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman would not wish to do me an injustice, and I really think his observation, although it might have been made before my explanation, is not fair after it. I did not complain of the interruption, which indicated to me that my remark might be interpreted as implying an assumption on my part that those Liberals who propose to attend the projected demonstration were in accord with my policy. That certainly was not my intention, and I immediately withdrew it. Perhaps I need not have referred to the demonstration at all, but it was very much in my mind as the latest exhibition of the friendliness of my fellow-citizens; and what I meant to say was that the friendliness which has so continually been accorded to me by my own people in Birmingham is a proof that at all events what is called the revolt has not got gone very far.

*MR. ASQUITH: My point is that the demonstration ought not to have been made use of in the present connection, and that attendance at it ought not to be treated as having any political significance whatsoever. However, I pass to the general policy of the Motion before the House. I quite admit that all of us who sit upon these Front Benches are tarred with the same brush in this matter; we have all been parties in our time to proposing and opposing Motions of this kind. But the right hon. Gentleman has enunciated what appeared to me to be a very crude Parliamentary principle in regard to this matter. That principle, as I understand it, is this: If you think a Bill is bad you may obstruct it; if good, you may closure it; and therefore the question whether or not the closure should in any given state of circumstances be applied depends, not upon the history of the Bill, not on the character of the opposition given to it, but upon whether or not the majority of the House think it to be a good Bill or a bad Bill. Mr. Gladstone said, and very justly, that the majority must prevail. So it must, but still an equally important thing is the manner and the spirit in which the majority should prevail. I venture to say—and this is the proposition I shall endeavour to demonstrate to the House—that, whether you look at this Motion from the point of view of Parliamentary precedent or of the special circumstances of this particular matter, the case for it is too slender to be eked out, even, as we have just now seen, by the great rhetorical ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman.

Let me for one moment refer to the precedents upon which both the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary relied. They are four in number. In 1887 there was the Crimes Act. There are many of us who opposed that Bill at the time with all the resistance in our power, and we opposed the Closure upon it. That Closure was proposed and was granted by Parliament upon one simple ground—*salus populi suprema lex.* The condition of Ireland was supposed to be such at the time that unless Parliament promptly placed in the hand of the Executive the exceptional powers proposed by the Bill, the maintenance of law and order and social peace could not be secured. No such case is attempted to be made for the present Bill. Then there is the precedent of 1888. In that year the closure was applied in the most drastic and summary fashion on the Bill for establishing what is called the Parnell Commission. Many of us on this side thought that a very high-handed and impolitic measure; but there, again, a specific and temporary emergency was being dealt with. The object of the Bill was to call into existence a temporary tribunal, with limited powers, for the particular purpose of inquiring into the truth or falsehood of certain accusations brought against Members of this House in a publication that was then notorious. But whether the closure of that Bill was wise or unwise, it forms no precedent whatever for the closure of the Education Bill.

Then we come to the cases which have been much more elaborated—those of the Home Rule Bill of 1893, and the Evicted Tenants Bill of 1894. Both were proceedings to which I, in common with many of my right hon. friends, was a party. The right hon. Gentleman just now relied very much upon the precedent of the Home Rule Bill. But is it a precedent at all? In the first place, the Parliament of 1892, whatever the right hon. Gentleman may say about the Newcastle programme, was elected specifically and expressly to deal with the question of Home Rule; and whether or not the Members of the majority swore allegiance to one or other of the items in that programme, I venture to say there was not a single Member on the Government side of the House at the time who had not pledged himself, not only to vote for Home Rule, but to make the support of Home Rule the very first of his Parliamentary duties. But that is not all. The right hon. Gentleman told us that many of the details of the Home Rule Bill actually presented to Parliament had not been before the constituencies. That is perfectly true. But I venture to say, and everyone who took part in those debates will bear me out, that there was not a single one of the great leading problems connected with Home Rule which had not been ventilated, controverted, debated, and examined over and over again, upon every platform and in every newspaper of the country during a period of at least seven years. Then, as to the Amendments to the Home Rule Bill—a large number of which were undoubtedly excluded by the application of the Closure—their object for the most part was, not to increase the efficiency of the measure, but avowedly and ostensibly to make it absurd, unworkable, and self-destructive.

The remaining precedent is the closuring of the Evicted Tenants Bill of 1894. What have we to say to that? That was a purely temporary measure to deal with a particular emergency. My right hon. friend who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland will bear me out, I think, when I say that it dealt with a sum of £100,000 or £200,000 of public money. In the opinion of the Irish Executive of the time it was a measure, the passing of which was absolutely essential to the maintenance of order in Ireland. It is ridiculous to say that that is any precedent for the present proposal. And here let me point out that in both of the cases in which closure by compartments was resorted to by a Liberal Government the House of Lords made very short shrift of the Bills. Have we any such prospect in this case? Why, Sir, I venture to say that when this Motion is carried, when this Bill is passed, if it is to be passed, the country will begin to realise that the most revolutionary thing it can do is to entrust a Conservative Government with a Parliamentary majority. For what happens? This Bill, which, as I shall show in a moment, was never presented to the country or considered by the country, or even dreamt of by serious politicians at the time of the General Election, is introduced into this House, and is then closured by compartments with the certainty that it will slide quietly and rapidly on well-oiled self-acting castors along the floor of the Second Chamber.

But there is more than that to be said. If this Motion is adopted—and I construe the latter portion of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks in that sense—it will be a precedent for the permanent incorporation of this procedure of closure by compartments in our Parliamentary practice. If that procedure can be applied to this Bill, I do not hesitate to say that it can be applied to any Bill of which the imagination of man can conceive. What have you got here? You have got what is admitted by the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues to be a large and sweeping change not only in our educational but in our administrative system. Is it a change—and here I come to close quarters with the right hon. Gentleman—for which the country was prepared? I do not rely upon a single phrase in a single speech of the Colonial Secretary, but let me remind the House of what was said by a great and perfectly impartial authority not mixed up with the tumult and dust of our Parliamentary conflicts. What was said by the head of the English Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury, only five years ago? The Archbishop of Canterbury at that time warned the Church not to place themselves on what he called the slippery incline of rate aid.

He has now told us, in a recent authorized commentary upon that text, that he never dreamed at that moment, or, I suppose, for a considerable time afterwards, that any responsible Government in this country would propose to support denominational schools out of the rates while retaining their control in the hands of the Church. I will venture to refer to another authority—the Prime Minister himself. I am not going to refer to an election address or to election speeches, but to what I think is still more relevant to the purpose—a speech made by him after the election was over on November 10th, 1900, in Christ Church schoolroom, Manchester. The election was now over. The country knew perfectly well whom they had been voting for and what they had been voting for, and this is the advice which the Prime Minister then gave to the managers of voluntary schools in his own constituency. He said—

> "They had two great Church schools in a high state of efficiency, but, as everybody knew who had followed educational controversy in England, there was no greater difficulty in the way of these schools which were not supported out of the rates than the difficulty involved in keeping pace with the ever-growing requirements of modern education. They believed, as he believed, in the great national necessity of maintaining the voluntary schools. They held that this necessity involved a corresponding effort on the part of those who supported the schools."

What has become of the corresponding effort?

> "They had, of course, large support from Government sources, but they had not the advantage which the neighbouring Board Schools had of being able to put their hands into the generous pockets of the ratepayers to carry out their duty."

That was perfectly true; but is that the language of a statesman who had in his pocket, or in his pigeon-hole, or at the back of his mind, a scheme for giving rate aid to denominational schools? What would the right hon. Gentleman have said if he had had any such scheme, or had thought that the electors when they supported him had contemplated any such scheme as possible? He would have used very different language. He would have said, "Endure for a little time the intolerable strain. The streaks of dawn are in the horizon. There is a good time coming. There is a Government installed in power to which you have given a Parliamentary majority for five or, it may be, seven years to come, and you may rely upon that Government to open for you the fertilising sluices of the rate-fed reservoir." No, Sir, it was because the right hon. Gentleman, in common with his supporters, and, I venture to say the great mass of electors in this country, had at that time no conception that any such scheme as this could possibly obtain Parliamentary sanction and support, that he used the language to which I have referred.

But the right hon. Gentleman has referred, as further justification for this Motion, to the Amendments which have been moved. I must confess that upon this matter I prefer the testimony of the Prime Minister, who has been present throughout the debate, and who has acquitted the Opposition throughout all these long discussions of anything in the nature of obstruction, to that of the right hon. Gentleman whom other duties—I do not blame him for it—have withdrawn from personal participation in these debates. But not only have the Amendments not been obstructive, but, as the Bill in its present form shows, they have been in the highest degree fruitful and remunerative. My hon. friend the Member for Elland at an earlier stage of the evening pointed out that by Amendments to the 12 Clauses which had been discussed no less than 120 lines have been added. I will take two Clauses by way of illustration; and here let me remark first in reference to what the right hon. Gentleman has just said, that it is not a question of the number of days that you take over a Clause which determines the question whether or not it has been properly debated; the criterion is the extent, character, and value of the Amendments and additions made. If we are to go by the number of days, I might remind the right hon. Gentleman, and some of those who sit behind him, of what took place in the autumn of 1893, when we were discussing what was described by all Parties as a purely non-controversial measure—the Parish Councils Bill. In that Bill, over Clause 13, the Opposition occupied six days, and over Clause 19 no less than seven days, and no one has ever suggested that either of those Clauses contained anything, either expressly or by inference one-tenth part as controversial as heaps of the points which bristle in almost every one of the Clauses of this Bill. But, leaving that aside, let me remind the House simply of what has overtaken two of the Clauses of the present Bill. First of all, the second Clause, a very important one, which deals with higher education, when the Bill was introduced was purely permissive both as regards the adoption of the powers and as regards the expenditure of the whisky money supplied by the State as the Parliamentary contribution for higher education. That Clause occupied nearly a week in discussion, but it has emerged in a shape, both as regards powers and expenditure, which is practically mandatory. I say that the House of Commons occupied that week in a thoroughly businesslike manner. Let me take one other illustration, the eighth Clause, which I suppose has taken a larger amount of discussion in point of time and of the number of speeches and Amendments than any other Clause of the Bill. Am I exaggerating when I say that in the course of the ten days it occupied it has been completely transformed? This Clause, which in the shape in which we now see it is hardly recognisable by its own parents, embraces the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, which has given so much trouble outside, and which I think my hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon was not unduly uncharitable in suggesting was possibly the inducement to this wholesale closure. If you look at the Bill and the work which has actually been done upon it, I venture to say not only that the Amendments proposed have been consistent for the most part with the scope and objects of the Bill, but that the Amendments which the Government and the majority of the House have adopted are to the infinite improvement of the measure itself. Notwithstanding the sneer of the Colonial Secretary, I wish to ask the House of Commons, as a deliberative Assembly, why should not the same process be applied to the remaining Clauses of the Bill? Is there any more reason to think that they in their original form embody infallible wisdom than to think so in the case of those Clauses which have been so largely transformed by their authors? There is no case whatsoever made out for the Closure of the discussion of those Clauses; and I will add this—which, from the point of view both of the efficiency and dignity of the House, is not an unimportant consideration—that if you wish to make this Bill, as you profess, a workable scheme, if it is to be the basis of a permanent solution of the problem of national education, you cannot do a greater disservice to it, you cannot at the outset more effectually overcloud the prospect, than by forcing it through this House, in which alone the representatives of popular opinion can be heard, by arbitrary and drastic measures such as those which are now proposed.

I venture to say that until this debate, whether you look back to the precedents of the past or to the reason of the thing, both the theory and the practice of the House of Commons have been that this procedure, which we all regret, which none of us like, which we admit to be inconsistent with the elementary rights and privileges of a debating assembly—this procedure has never been and ought not to be resorted to except in one or two cases, in a case of extreme emergency in the interests of public order, or in the case where a Bill, having been carefully considered, both by the country and by Parliamentary discussion, is ripe for a final decision. What are you doing here? You are violating those traditions; you are flying in the face of experience; you are establishing a precedent which, I venture to say, once established will be repeated and applied in cases which will be extremely unwelcome to the large majority of those who are going to vote for this Motion. You are going to apply this procedure, which has hitherto been confined within limited and rational bounds, to a Measure which is at once complex and revolutionary, which is neither urgent in its occasion nor temporary in its operation, as to which the country has never been consulted, against the hasty and ill-considered passage of which our Second Chamber affords us no effectual safeguard, and by so doing you are taking a step which is unwarranted by precedent, which is of the most dangerous example, and which ought not lightly to be adapted by the House of Commons.

(11.28.) Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 284, Noes, 152. (Division List No. 496.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (Bury S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Iver Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard John (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H. (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry

Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. F. W. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliam H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb,Colonel William George
Welby,Lt-Col A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown,George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Duncan, J. (Hastings)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth. R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren,Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone
and Mr. William M'Arthur.

*(11.45) Sir EDWARD STRACHEY Somersetshire, S.) moved an Amendment with the object of reserving a day for the discussion of Clause 13. If the Amendment was not accepted by the Prime Minister, the effect would be that there would not be adequate time left for the discussion of Clause 13, which contained the financial provisions of the Bill. He appealed to county Members, the great majority of whom sat on the Government Benches, to support the Amendment. They had, in season and out of season, reiterated the statement that they were the protectors of the ratepayers in their districts. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford had on the Paper an Amendment to Clause 13 proposing to leave out "expenses of a Council under this Act," and to insert "expenditure out of rates under this Act shall in no case exceed one-fourth of the whole expenditure on education by the Education Authority, and the expenses of that authority." It was very doubtful whether that Amendment would be discussed at all if the First Lord's proposal remained as it now stood. The right hon. Gentleman's Amendment had the unanimous support of the Central Chamber of Agriculture. All that hon. Members representing agricultural districts asked at present was that ample time should be allowed for the discussion of the Clause on Thursday next instead of its being guillotined on Wednesday. He ventured to think that the Education Rate would press heavily indeed on the occupiers of houses and land, and especially those occupying small farms, who at present often paid no Education Rate at all. Under Clause 2 of the Bill as it now stood it was obligatory that the County Council should provide higher education, and also that they should provide training colleges for teachers. The duty of providing training colleges was one which the Government should not place on small farmers and the occupiers of small houses in the rural districts. He appealed to the Government to consider whether the rating proposal in the Bill was really a fair one to the agricultural population. He hoped they would at least give a day to county Members to bring their case before the House, and to ask for fair treatment for occupiers of houses in town or country as well as occupiers of land. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the Question—

"To leave out the words in line 7, and insert the words 'on Wednesday the 12th November, and on Clause 13 on Thursday the 13th November.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. CHAPLIN supported the Amendment of his hon. friend. Clause 13, he said, dealt with the whole question of the expenses of the Bill, and surely it was not unreasonable to ask that a day should be given for the discussion of its provisions. He reminded the House in the first instance that the question of expenses had not yet been discussed at all in the House in the whole of these proceedings, and secondly, that unless they were able to obtain the opportunity tomorrow, there would never be any opportunity, so far as he could see, for discussing that branch of the question. It was certain that, under the closure proposal of his right hon. friend, the Clause could never be reached on the Report stage, and as far as he could form an opinion of the constitutional aspect of this question, the matter could never be discussed in the other House of Parliament. There were seventy-six Amendments on the Paper to Clause 13, and some of them were very important indeed. He might tell the House that such was the interest in the question to which his own Amendment referred that, during the present day he had received fifty letters and telegrams from all parts of the country asking him to proceed with it. There was immense interest felt on the subject, because the people were afraid that the charge on the rates in the course of a year or two would be infinitely larger than many Members had ever thought of. The agricultural Members wished to have an opportunity of taking the sense of Parliament on the question as to how far it was right that the expenses of a great national object should be borne by the local rates at all.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) asked the Prime Minister whether having regard to sub-Clauses (*a*), (*c*), and (*d*) in Clause 13, the House even yet knew the full financial proposals of the Government. Had not the Government still revelations to make with regard to their finance which would affect the consideration of sub-Clauses (*a*), (*c*), and (*d*)?

Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W. R., Shipley) said that the First Lord indicated that Clauses 12 and 13 would be closured on the morrow. He wished to ask his right hon. friend whether the discussion on Clause 12 could not be terminated at the afternoon sitting, leaving the whole of the evening sitting for Clause 13.

*Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that before the right hon. Gentleman answered the Member for Shipley, he wished to support the Amendment most strongly on a ground not yet brought before the House. There were very important Amendments down on the Paper standing in the name of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education which affected the most vital interests of urban districts. They would alter the whole basis of rating, and had been put down on the Paper at the request of Members on both sides of the House. There was no doubt that that the question which would be raised by the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Sleaford was likely to be debated at some length—the question, he meant, of the relative share of the expenses to be borne from the local rates and by the Imperial Treasury. That was a matter which could not be debated in a few minutes, but would take several hours; and he asked the hon. Gentleman whether he could not give more time to the discussion of Clause 13, the more especially as his own proposal would operate as a guillotine to the Amendments of the Secretary to the Education Department.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will relieve the fears of the hon. Gentleman at once in regard to the Amendments put down in the name of the Government by the hon. Member for Oxford University with which he agrees. These Amendments, the Closure notwithstanding, will be put to the House, and I trust will be carried by the House, so that the hon. Gentleman's fears have no foundation. As to the remarks of the right hon. the Member for Forest of Dean, the Government have made no change whatever in their financial proposals, but I doubt whether in their proper aspect they can be discussed under Clause 13. They will come up under a new Clause which gives the Government grant, and under a Resolution which we have placed on the Paper. My hon. friend the Member for Shipley asks that Clause 12 should be thrashed out at the morning's sitting, but as I understand the matter, there is nothing controversial in it, and I do not think the difference with the Welsh Members will be difficult to settle. It would be a great disappointment to me if any unexpected discussion took place on Clause 12 which prevented us from passing it at the morning's sitting. I hope that my right hon. friend the Member for Sleaford will have ample scope to discuss Clause 13 to-morrow. Questions affecting the ratepayers are not numerous in the Clause, though they may be important. But, if the House thinks it desirable, I have no objection to running (*a*) and (*b*) into one paragraph. That would have the effect of leaving two days for discussing the dregs of Clause 12 and for considering Clauses 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. I quite agree that no question of great importance is raised on Clauses 14, 15, 16, and 17, and if my proposal meets the general view, it can be carried out without affecting the general scheme of business.

MR. CHAPLIN said that so far as he was concerned, he would readily and gladly accept the right hon. Gentleman's offer.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that after what had been said by the right hon. the Member for Sleaford, and the offer of the First Lord having given him all he asked for, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

An Amendment made—

"By leaving out from the word 'on,' in line 7, to the word 'Clauses,' in line 8, and by inserting, after the word 'Clauses,' the word '13.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said he wished to move in paragraph (*f*), line 19, to omit the words "on Thursday, November 20th," in order to insert "Monday, 24th November." His object was to extend the time for the consideration of the new Clauses introduced by the Government, as well as the new Clauses proposed by private Members. The first of the new Government Clauses dealt with the Aid Grant of £900,000 on an entirely new principle; the next dealt with the managers; the next with endowments; and the next with grouping of schools; to say nothing of the large number of Amendments which had been put down in regard to the Schedules. There were no less than sixteen new points to be discussed in two days.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 19, to leave out the words 'Thursday, 20th,' and insert the words 'Monday, 24th.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope that the hon. Gentleman will not persist in this Amendment. He will see that we have given the whole of Monday the 17th, Tuesday the 18th, Wednesday the 19th, and Thursday the 20th. to the new Clauses. I think that is adequate time. Of course, the House might desire more time, but I do not think that anyone can say that the compartment is too limited or restricted in its scope. I would remind the House that I have framed this Resolution on the most extended scale compatible with bringing the proceedings on this Bill to an end before the Christmas holidays. If we extend that scale further the House will have to meet after the Christmas holidays to deal with the Bill. That, I think, would not be agreeable to the House generally, nor would it be desirable. Therefore, I hope that the hon. Gentleman will not press for any extension of the period which we have given to the new Clauses, knowing that it would carry with it the protraction of the debates on this Bill until after Christmas.

MR. TREVELYAN said that sub-Section (*f*) provided that the proceedings on the new Clause relating to managers, and any other Government new Clauses. and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, should terminate on Thursday, 20th November. Did that mean that there was to be no time between the Government new Clauses and the schedules for any possible discussion of private Members' Clauses?

Mr. LOUGH said he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman to substitute Friday the 21st, for Thursday, the 20th. Friday was not allocated to any purpose, and he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten about it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken is one which it would be desirable for the House to accept. It is usual and desirable to leave a longer interval between the Committee stage and the Report stage than would he possible if the Committee stage were finished on Friday. As regards the question of the hon. Member for the Elland Division, there is nothing in this closure by compartment which would prevent private Members' Clauses coming on. All the Resolution says is that whether private Members' Clauses come on or not, the Government Clauses and schedules must be disposed of by a certain fixed date. If the Government Clauses are rapidly disposed of, there will then be an opportunity for discussing private Members' Clauses.

Mr. TREVELYAN said that if the Government Clauses were got through, and if private Members' Clauses occupied the whole day, then there would be no discussion on the schedules.

Mr. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) asked if all the new Clauses which were to be introduced by the Government had yet been tabled.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, they have not all yet been tabled. I have left a certain margin, but there is nothing of any fundamental importance to be dealt with in the Clauses which have yet to be tabled. There will be nothing in them that need alarm my hon. friend.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) asked if the Clause as to the method of the appointment of managers had yet been tabled.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I think that is down.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON asked if all the Government new Clauses would be taken during the Committee stage.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My hope is that all the new Clauses of the Government will be dealt with in the Committee stage, but I do not like to give a pledge on the matter, as one cannot tell what the situation may be.

***Mr. HELME** (Lancashire, Lancaster) asked when the right hon. Gentleman would put on the Paper his proposal as to the relations of the Borough Councils in regard to the work they would have to do in the matter of secondary education as promised when Clause 3 was before the Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not quite sure that I know what the hon. Gentleman refers to.

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked if the right hon. Gentleman would not consider the advisability of allocating Friday, the 21st, to the schedules. They had not yet seen the new Clauses, and did not know how far they might be controversial, and several private Members' Clauses were of such importance as to require discussion. That would leave a fairly large amount of time between the Committee stage and the Report stage.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That would, I am afraid, be resented by the House.

(12.21.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 497.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, AlexanderH(Shropshire
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H(CityofLond.
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (KentFaversh'm
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt. HnW G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lieut-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel E. C.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Runciman and Mr. Trevelyan.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the right hon. Gentleman would see that the 25th, 27th, and 28th were accounted for, but that no provision had been made for the 26th. He did not know if he might assume that four days were to be allocated to the Report stage.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said that he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman that, from the circumstances of the case, that time should be extended. The right hon. Gentleman had said that if any extension were made it would involve the Bill going over until after

Christmas. But he would like the right hon. Gentleman to explain more closely how that calculation had been arrived at. A great deal had been said about precedents, and he would quote a precedent which ought to have some effect on the right hon. Gentleman, if he still had an open mind on the question. On the Home Rule Bill, after ten days discussion on Report, a Motion for the Closure was introduced, and four subsequent days were allocated to that stage. If the proceedings on the Home Rule Bill were to be an authority in one direction they ought also to be an authority in another direction; and inasmuch as fourteen days were allocated to the Report stage on that Bill, some reasonable concession ought now to be made with reference to the corresponding stage of the Education Bill. This Bill had, up to the present, been remodelled to a considerable extent. He believed that, as a matter of fact, about half of the Bill as it stood was new. He therefore submitted that there ought to be an opportunity of reconsidering the various alterations which had been introduced; and to contend that four days were sufficient for that purpose was absurd. He therefore moved in line 23, to leave out "on that day" in order to insert "Friday, 28th November."

Amendment proposed—

"In line 23, to leave out the words 'that day,' and insert the words, 'Friday, 28th November.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the hon. Gentleman desires that the period given under this Resolution to the Report stage should be extended, and that he bases his application on the proceedings on the Home Rule Bill. But the hon. Gentleman will remember that there are two very important differences between this Bill and the Home Rule Bill, which are relevant to the point he has raised. One of them is that, by common admission, the most important Clauses of this Bill, at any rate the most controversial Clauses, have been already dealt with at great length in Committee. That was not the case with the Home Rule Bill. For one reason or another, for which the Government or Opposition of the day might be to blame, many important questions were not discussed until the Report stage. That alone would be a reason for giving a smaller amount of time to the Report stage on this Bill than was given to the Report stage on the Home Rule Bill. I would also remind the hon. Gentleman that, in addition to many other differences, the Home Rule Bill consisted of twice the number of Clauses contained in the present Bill, which was a ground for granting a longer time to the Report stage. As far as I understood the hon. Gentleman, he did not dissent from the settled policy of the Government, that this Bill is, if possible, to be brought to a conclusion before the Christmas holidays, but I really think that that cannot be done if his Amendment is accepted. I admit it is not easy to make a calcuation as much will depend on the action that will be taken in another place; but, making the best calculation I can as to the time likely to be occupied in another place in the discussion of all the stages of this Bill, and leaving some time for the discussion in this House of any changes that may be made, I really cannot see that there is the smallest chance of our finishing all the stages of this Bill before December 19th; and I really think we should not make it later.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON said he hoped that the new proposals of the Government would be put down in good time.

Mr A. J. BALFOUR: I will do my very best, but the House will realise that we have been working under pressure.

Question put and agreed to.

(12.43.) Question put, "That the Proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill (including Proceedings on the Financial Resolution relating thereto) shall, unless previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion at the times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned:—

"(*a*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining part of Clause 12, and on Clauses 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, on Thursday, 13th November; (*b*) The proceedings on Clauses 18, 19, and 20, and on the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution, on Friday 14th November; (*c*) The proceedings on Report of the Financial Resolution, and on the new Clause relating to the aid grant, on Monday 17th November; (*d*) The proceedings on the New Clauses relating to endowments, local authority's managers, and grouping, on Tuesday 18th November; (*e*) The proceedings on the new Clause relating to managers, and any other Government new Clauses, on Schedules, and any new Government Schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, on Thursday 20th November; (*f*) The consideration of the Report shall be appointed for Tuesday 25th November; and the proceedings on Report on any new Clauses and on Amendments to Parts I. and II. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on that day; (*g*) The proceedings on Report on Amendments to Part III. of the Bill shall be brought to a conclusion on Thursday 27th November; (*h*) The proceedings on the Report of the Bill shall be concluded on Friday 28th November. At 11 P.M. on the said days, or, if the day is a Friday, at 4.30 P.M. the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith a Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business. In the case of new Clauses and Schedules, he shall put only the Question that such Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill. Proceedings under this Order shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 P.M.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House. After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Education

England and Wales) Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order 17, nor Motion to postpone a Clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 498.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A G H (City of London
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, RtHn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.

Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 12*th November*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Stafford; New Brancepeth; and Pittington; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Falkirk; Bradford; Duns; and South Shields; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Stafford; Pittington; New Brancepeth; and Durham (two); to lie upon the Table.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Scottish Trade Protection Society, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Stafford; New Brancepeth; and Pittington; to lie upon the Table.

REGISTRATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES BILL.

Petition from Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Navy—Accidents when Firing Salutes.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state how many accidents have occurred during the last ten years to men in the British Navy engaged in firing salutes; and what steps the Admiralty have taken or intend to take to ensure the observance of regulations on such occasions in future in order to avert such accidents.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) So far as can be ascertained, the recent accident in the "Victory" is the fourth that has occurred to saluting parties in His Majesty's ships during the last ten years. Each of these accidents was made the subject of a court of inquiry, and such additional instructions as were considered necessary by the Board of Admiralty were issued to the Fleet. The regulations already contained in the Gunnery Drill Book are considered to be quite sufficient to ensure safety in the firing of salutes, and the responsibility for the proper observance of these Regulations rests with the gunner in charge of the saluting party. It is not proposed to issue any further instructions in consequence of the accident in the "Victory."

Position of Seamen Pensioners Re-engaged.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any modification of the conditions has been arrived at affecting those seamen pensioners who re-engage for a further period of five years after completion of time for pension, and who have earned the good conduct medal and gratuity, which hitherto have been liable to forfeiture during this period of extra service.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The Admiralty have decided that in future when a man who is entitled to the maximum good conduct gratuity on completion of his second period of continuous service re-engages for a third period, he may be paid the good conduct gratuity to which he is entitled instead of waiting until he is discharged to pension. The good conduct medal, to which the hon. Member also refers, has always been awarded as soon as earned.

Postal Orders—Office of Payment.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.): To ask the Postmaster General, in view of the inconvenience caused by the rule that postal orders made payable at a town or city are payable only at the central office of that town or city to persons

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

living at a distance from the central office, will he alter this rule so that such postal orders may be payable at sub-offices.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is the practice to cash postal orders made payable at a town, without the mention of any particular office in it, either at the head office of the town or at any branch office. But I fear that an extension of this practice to all sub-post offices in a large town would be likely to facilitate fraud, and would render it very difficult to comply with a remitter's request to stop payment of an order.

American Locomotives on Uganda Railway.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in 1899 and 1900 only American locomotives were purchased for use on the Uganda Railway; whether he can state the reason of the change from the previous practice of purchasing English and Indian locomotives only; and whether any examination has been made of the comparative scale of locomotive expenses in connection with the various kinds of locomotives used.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The answer to the hon. Gentleman's Question is to be found in Sir Guilford Molesworth's Report (Africa, No. 5, 1899, p. 14). The locomotives referred to were ordered in the United States in October, 1898, because they were urgently wanted, and works in England were too congested with orders to give delivery within reasonable time. To have waited until English firms could guarantee delivery would have greatly delayed the construction of the railway, and thus caused heavy additional expense. No engines were at the time to be obtained from India. A detailed comparison between the various classes of engine shown upon page 3 of the Report has not been possible, but if the hon. Gentleman wishes it I will cause inquiry to be made.

Loans under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act.

MR. M'KENNA: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of loans sanctioned in respect of the forty-four applications to the Local Government Board from local authorities in England and Wales for sanction to loans under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, the total amount borrowed, and the number of houses actually bought by any persons under the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Local Government Board have sanctioned loans in respect of forty of the applications referred to, the amount sanctioned being £42,797. The greater part of this amount was sanctioned for advances in respect of 155 specified houses, and the remainder is to be used in making advances in other cases, particulars of which have not yet been given. I am not able to state the number of houses actually bought by reason of advances under the Act.

Alleged Grievances of Customs Boatmen.

MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether an early reply will be given as to the grievances of Customs boatmen, as the result of the recent inquiry by the Board of Customs.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) The answer to the boatmen's representations was postponed because it was considered that the question might be affected by the result of an inquiry now in progress into the duties of the waterguard generally. This inquiry will probably be concluded in a few weeks.

War Office—Clerical Employment of Ex-Soldiers.

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the principle upon which clerical employment at the War Office is given to applicants for such employment; and with whom the duty of selecting candidates rests.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) My hon. and gallant friend presumably refers to the employment of officers and ex-soldiers in the War Office. The selection of officers depends on their qualifications, combined with any special claims, and is therefore by merit. The candidate is recommended by the Commander-in-Chief to the Secretary of State for approval. The selection of ex-soldiers depends on their qualifications, preference being as far as possible given to men who have suffered in health from wounds, or other effects of active service, provided that they have the requisite clerical experience.

Militia—Strength and Recruiting Statistics.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House the difference between the present strength of the Militia and that of the Establishment, exclusive of officers and permanent staff, laid down for 1902-3, and if he has any official Reports showing the present state of recruiting for the Militia, and whether the deficiency in numbers will soon be made good.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Establishment is 123,016, and the strength on the 1st October was 104,380. The deficiency is considerably less than in preceding years, the recruiting showing a marked improvement. If the Bill for establishing a new Militia Reserve becomes law in the present session, I hope that next year will see great progress towards making up the Establishment.

Volunteer Establishment Statistics.

*LORD CHARLES BERESFORD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House of the number by which effective Volunteers are short of the number laid down as the establishment for 1902-03, and the number of resignations in all ranks that has taken place during the last three months.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The establishment has gradually risen during the war to 346,450, but it was not contemplated this would be permanent. The strength on the 1st October was 272,957. The number who voluntarily quitted the force between 1st July and 1st September was 4,261; the details for the month of October are not yet reported. It is probable that the numbers of the force will gradually assimilate themselves to those before the war, which averaged about 225,000, which the Military authorities consider fully adequate to all needs on mobilisation, provided they are really efficient.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South African War—Commissions for Volunteer Officers.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has been brought to his notice that there is dissatisfaction among the officers commanding Volunteer Active Service Companies in the late war, some of whom were mentioned in despatches, owing to the fact that they have been, with one or two exceptions, excluded from the marks of appreciation given to officers in the Regular Army, and will he state why those officers who have been recommended by their Commanding Officers for permanent commissions in the rank in which they have served during the campaign have not been admitted to such regular service; and whether he will take steps to remove the alleged grievance.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I regret that there should be any dissatisfaction among the officers named, whose services are highly appreciated, but no such dissatisfaction has reached me. Out of 589 Volunteer officers employed in South Africa, seventy were mentioned in despatches, and of these sixteen received rewards. No promise was made of regular commissions—these have only been given in exceptional cases. The hon. Member is probably aware that many Militia Officers who did good service in South Africa, and who wished for line commissions, have not obtained them. In so long a war, where so much good service has been done, it is impossible to reward everyone, and nearly 5,000 officers were mentioned in despatches.

New Garrison Regiments.

MR. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby): I beg to ask the Secretary to State for War whether he has any official report as to the conduct and efficiency of the new garrison regiments at Malta and elsewhere, and as to the result of the experiment of their employment.

MR. BRODRICK: Official reports have been received from Malta. The scheme is working satisfactorily, despite its having been necessary to start it during the war, when the selection of officers and non-commissioned officers was necessarily limited. The privates are a fine body of men, who can shoot and march well. A steady improvement is expected by the Commander-in-Chief, now that special attention can be given to the composition of these regiments.

Railway Brakes.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the meeting of railway officials held at the Railway Clearing House during last month (October) to consider the question of either side brakes on railway waggons, he can say if the brakes are of uniformity in application, and if they have been approved by the Board of Trade.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Board of Trade have not at present received from the Railway Companies any report of the proceedings at the meeting referred to.

Railway Servants' Hours of Labour—L. C. and D. Railway.

MR. BELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the case of an assistant guard at Hither Green Station, on the South Eastern and Chatham Railway, who was called on duty on Sunday, 2nd November, at 10.30 a.m., after completing one shift of duty at 8 a.m., and having worked 84 hours that week; and whether he will take steps to prevent the employment of guards for so prolonged a period, and to provide for proper intervals for rest.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No representations on behalf of the railway servant referred to have reached the Board of Trade. Such representations, if made, would be dealt with in accordance with the Act of 1893.

Railway Crossing Fatality at Thames Ironworks.

MR. BELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a fatal accident which occurred to Henry Eade at the Thames Ironworks level crossing on the Great Eastern Railway, on the 6th instant, through the gates not being locked from the signal cabin; and will he take steps to get the interlocking system put into operation at this place.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; this sad accident was duly notified to the Board of Trade, and they have received the Coroner's Return. The crossing in question is stated to be a private or occupation crossing, and the requirements as to public road crossings are therefore not applicable, but I am informed that a gatekeeper is in attendance. I shall be happy, however, to put the hon. Member's suggestion before the railway company.

Roads in Mid-Ross.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Congested Districts Board are aware that the Mid-Ross District Committee report that the proposed road from the Dundonnell Road to Badluachrach cannot be proceeded with owing to the grant offered by the Congested Districts Board being insufficient; and, seeing that the people of the district have already constructed part of the road, will the Congested Districts Board consider the expediency of increasing their grant.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Congested Districts Board intimated to the County Council of Ross and Cromarty that they were prepared to make a grant of 75 per cent. of the estimated cost of the road in question, and in the opinion of the Congested Districts Board no case for an increase of the grant has been made out.

Island of Lewis—Hospital Accommodation.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Lewis District Committee report that, in consequence of the public health assessment for the Lewis district for the past year being at the maximum rate of 1s. per £, they are unable to borrow the money required for the construction of a hospital at Carloway, the plans of which have been approved by the Local Government Board; and, in view of the fact that this hospital is urgently needed for cases of infectious diseases, will he state whether the Secretary for Scotland proposes to take any steps, by legislation or otherwise, to enable local authorities to provide hospital accommodation for infectious diseases in the congested districts of the Island of Lewis.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to his Question of yesterday.†

MR. WEIR: The right hon. Gentleman has not, evidently, read the Question. The latter part of it is not referred to in the answer I got yesterday—viz., does the Secretary for Scotland propose to take any steps, by legislation or otherwise, to enable local authorities to provide hospital accommodation.

* MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I said that we could not take steps at this present moment.

MR. WEIR: I am quite aware of that, but—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman has fully answered the Question.

MR. WEIR: No, Sir; the Question is—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I cannot enter into any argument whether or not the answer is satisfactory.

MR. WEIR: But—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. WEIR: I must take another opportunity of dealing with this question.

Applecross (Ross) Road and Bridge.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, seeing that the Western District Committee for the county of Ross and Cromarty report that a road and bridge at Applecross are urgently necessary, will he state on what ground the Congested Districts Board have declined to provide a grant in aid of the work.

* MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: On the ground that the local authorities have more than once altered, and have so much enlarged their plans in comparison with the original proposal placed before the Congested Districts Board, and that the Board are not satisfied that the public benefit to be gained would be commensurate with the expenditure now suggested.

Island of Lewis Fisheries.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, whether the petition to His Majesty the King, signed by over 2,000 crofters, cottars, fishermen, and others of the island of Lewis, has reached the hands of the Secretary for Scotland; and, if so, will he state what action it is proposed to take in the matter.

* MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I can only refer the hon. Member to my reply to his similar Question of yesterday.†

Typhus Fever at Ness.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the entrance to the house in the district of Ness, island of Lewis, in which a man named Mackay died of typhus fever on the 14th September last, is so near other houses that it was impossible to get a coffin inside the house, and that the body of Mackay had to be taken out before it could be coffined; will he state whether the Local Government Board for Scotland have approved any bye-laws such as will admit of the early destruction of similar insanitary houses in the island of Lewis; and, if not, will he state what steps the Local Government Board propose to take in the matter.

* MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Secretary for Scotland is not aware of the facts as stated by the hon. Member. On the contrary, the Secretary for Scotland is informed that the body of Mackay was coffined in the room where he, Mackay, died. The Local Government Board has no bye-laws, or power to make such bye-laws, as the hon. Member suggests. In this particular case, however, permission has been obtained from the heirs of deceased to destroy the house in question.

MR. WEIR: I can only say that the information supplied to the right hon. Gentleman is absolutely false.

* MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

---

† See page 594.

† See page 595.

MR. WEIR: I was on the spot and saw it.

Scottish Fishery Board—Mr. McIloy.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the qualifications of Mr. McIloy, ironmonger, of Rothesay, Buteshire, for appointment as a member of the Scottish Fishery Board.

* MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The qualifications of the gentleman in question are the same now as they were when he was appointed more than five years ago. He is a native of, and exceptionally well acquainted with, the Western Highlands adjoining the Firth of Clyde; he has a large acquaintance with the local fishermen; and is an ex-Provost of Rothesay. I ought to add that his services to the Board, of which he is an unpaid member, have been unremitting; and he has by those services given complete satisfaction to his colleagues and to the Secretary for Scotland.

MR. WEIR: And a good Tory.

* MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The hon. Member asked me as to his special qualifications for appointment to the Fishery Board; I did not think it necessary to add my testimony to his general good sense, which is well known.

Ireland—Labourers' Cottages at Roscrea.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the action of certain district councillors in the Roscrea No. 3 Rural District, in respect of applications of labourers for cottages and plots under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts; and whether he will direct the inspectors of the Local Government Board to insist on suitable sites being selected in this district.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Inspector who held the recent inquiry into the scheme proposed by the District Council, states that the Council gave very intelligent consideration to the various representations, and selected the sites with much judgment. The result of the inquiry will shortly be communicated to the Council.

Mutoscopes at Longford.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been directed to complaints as to the nature of the living pictures exhibited in mutoscopes at Longford and in public places at other railway stations in Ireland; and whether he will direct the Royal Irish Constabulary to institute prosecutions in any of these cases.

MR. WYNDHAM: No complaints have been made to the Constabulary in this matter, either in County Longford or elsewhere in Ireland.

MR. TULLY: Why don't the Constabulary look after these things, instead of the public having to direct attention to them?

Dr. Starkie and Irish Primary School Managers.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the resolutions of the clerical managers of national schools in the diocese of Dromore, and in the diocese of Ardagh, as to the continuance of Dr. Starkie as Resident Commissioner of National Education; and whether he is prepared to take any action in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have seen the resolutions referred to. I have nothing to add to the reply given by me on Wednesday last, to a similar Question of the hon. Member.†

MR. TULLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware of the agitation caused in Ireland by this gentleman's conduct?

Trade of the Port of Limerick.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he has received resolutions from the Limerick Chamber of Commerce and Limerick Harbour Board, complaining that the Congested Districts Board have, to the detriment of the Port of Limerick, subsidised the Clyde Company at Cork; and whether he can state on what grounds the Board have refused a subsidy to a Limerick steamer trading with the south and south-west ports.

---

† See page 147.

MR. WYNDHAM: This matter received the very careful consideration of the Congested Districts Board, and the conclusion come to was that a case for subsidising two lines of steamers on the same coast was not made out. The payment of the subsidy to the Clyde Company has been continued for a further period of one year, as a tentative measure.

Illegal Fishing in Dublin Bay.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether complaints have been received as to the destruction caused in Dublin Bay to line fishermen by trawlers; and whether instructions will be given to the Commander of the "Helga," in Kingstown Harbour, to safeguard the rights of line fishermen in Dublin Bay.

MR. WYNDHAM: Every precaution is taken to prevent illegal fishing in these waters, both by the new Department's cruiser and the coastguard.

Sligo and the Canadian Mail Service.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received resolutions from the Sligo Corporation and Sligo Harbour Board as to the adoption of Sligo as a port of call for the fast Atlantic mail service with Canada; and if he can state whether he proposes to give effect to these resolutions.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no power to give effect to such resolutions. But any representations made to me in the matter of harbour facilities in the west of Ireland will receive the consideration of the Government.

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman consent to receive a deputation from the Sligo Corporation on the subject?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will consider that.

Resignation of Sir David Harrel—The New Under Secretary—Government Land Purchase Policy.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can indicate the grounds upon which the resignation has been accepted of Sir David Harrel as Under Secretary; and if he can state when he will be in a position to announce the change of Irish policy connected with the appointment of Sir Antony M'Donnel to that position.

MR. WYNDHAM: The first query is unusual. In reply, I have to say that the sole ground for accepting Sir David Harrel's resignation was that it is impossible to persist in asking a public servant to re-consider a resignation tendered after prolonged, exacting, devoted and distinguished service, upon the sole ground of ill-health. May I add that I cannot, within the compass of an answer, express my gratitude to Sir David Harrel for the assistance he has given me, or my admiration of the work he has done for his country. In reply to the second Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the speech which I made in the House on Monday, 27th October†, and to the announcement, more than once repeated, that a Land Purchase Bill will be the principal measure of next session.

MR. TULLY: Was not that speech a coercion speech?

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): When the right hon. Gentleman says "principal" measure next session, does he mean principal Government measure or principal Irish measure?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think it is premature to discuss the exact hierarchical precedence of measures at this stage.

MR. BRYCE: My Question merely arose out of the expression used by the right hon. Gentleman, which seemed to me to be ambiguous.

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether he is prepared to drop the policy of coercion?

Prosecutions of Ladies under the Crimes Act.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many ladies have been prosecuted for newspaper offences since the passing of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, how many ladies have been imprisoned under the operations of that Act, and what is the nature of the prison treatment in their cases.

---

† See preceding volume, page 914.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There have been two such prosecutions. One was dismissed. In the other case the defendant was called upon to give sureties for good behaviour, or to go to prison in default. The conviction was confirmed by the Superior Court. Persons committed to prison in default of entering into sureties are subject to the rules prescribed for prisoners awaiting trial. These rules will be found in Parliamentary Papers Nos. 129 and 189 of this Session.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman look into the case he has referred to. It is one which excites a great amount of sympathy all over Ireland, and everybody believes this lady to be the victim of circumstances. She is not in good health.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Of course the question of the health of a prisoner always receives careful consideration.

Mr. TULLY: Then let her off.

Carlow—Prosecutions under the Sanitary Laws.

Mr. CAREW: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the prosecutions at the last Carlow Petty Sessions for breaches of the sanitary laws, which were dismissed, although the offences complained of still continue; and whether he will take steps to have the sanitary laws enforced in these cases.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): The prosecutions, which were instituted at the suit of the District Council, were dismissed without prejudice, owing, I believe, to some technical informality in the framing of the summons. Fresh proceedings are, I understand, about to be instituted. It is the duty of the local sanitary authority, not of the Crown, to enfore the sanitary laws in the district.

Londonderry Postal Arrangements.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been directed to resolutions passed by the Londonderry Corporation requesting him to establish a Sunday morning delivery of letters in that city, and will he grant this request.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The Corporation were informed on the 29th ultimo that their request for a house to house delivery of letters in the Londonderry Town District on Sundays, in place of the present delivery to callers at the Post Office, will be complied with if they will furnish me with an assurance that the inhabitants generally are in favour of the change.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: But has not the right hon. Gentleman received an assurance from the Corporation, by way of resolution passed by that body, informing him that the inhabitants are in favour of the change?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think not.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: I happened to be present at the meeting at which it was passed.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It has not reached me personally.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: Will the right hon. Gentleman further inquire?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, of course I will.

Post Office and the Irish Language.

Mr. CAREW: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that complaints have been made in Navan, county Meath, as to the delay and non-delivery of letters addressed in Irish characters to the secretary of the Navan Branch of the Gaelic League; and whether he will arrange that post office officials in Ireland shall acquire a knowledge of the Irish language so as to prevent a repetition of these complaints.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No such complaint has reached me. As regards the general Question, I can add nothing to the answer given by me to the hon. Member for South Leitrim on the 10th instant.†

MR. TULLY: Why will the right hon. Gentleman carry on this boycotting of the Irish language?

Newry Railway Accident.

MR. BELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether an accident which occurred to a fireman named Bernard Smith, at Newry on the Great Northern Railway (Ireland) on 15th September last, has been reported to the Board of Trade; and, if so, will he state when it was reported.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir. The accident referred to has not been notified to the Board of Trade, and inquiry is being made of the Railway Company concerned.

Wreckage off the Donegal Coast.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what steps have been taken by the Irish Lights Commissioners to have removed the wreck, already reported to them, from the Channel, off Burtonport, County Donegal, and thereby remove a source of danger to the shipping frequenting that coast.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights that they are not aware of the existence of any wreck in the Channel off Burtonport. The attention of the Board of Trade and of the Commissioners was called last September to a letter in a newspaper stating that the writer had seen a wreck seven miles from the west end of Tory Island, but all attempts to trace the writer of the letter have failed. During the present month the Board of Trade has received a letter from the gentleman who originally forwarded the newspaper saying that he, too, had found it impossible to trace the writer, and that he had come to the conclusion that the letter was a hoax.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct the Irish Lights Commissioners to make a search for the wreckage?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: So far as can be learned, it has not been seen by anybody.

MR. O'DOHERTY: But have you not received a letter from a county councillor and local magistrate stating that the wreck had been seen?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware of it.

MR. O'DOHERTY: You acknowledged the receipt.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Oh, it was an anonymous letter, I believe.

Armagh Income Tax Appeals.

*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Commissioners of Income Tax do not now sit for the hearing of Appeals in the city of Armagh as formerly, and that, in consequence, appellants from Armagh and the neighbouring district are put to cost and inconvenience by having to go to Portadown; and whether, seeing that Armagh is central for the county, also the county town, he will direct that sittings of the Court shall he held there in future.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham): The Special Commissioners of Income Tax have not sat at Armagh since 1900, but they would be ready to do so in any year in which the amount of business there may make it desirable.

MR. LONSDALE: There were no fewer than forty Appeals at the last sittings, and the appellants had to travel from Armagh to Portadown.

MR. HAYES FISHER: I was not aware of that, but it seems to point to the desirability of holding the sittings at Armagh in such a case.

Londonderry Shipbuilding Yard.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Londonderry Shipbuilding Yard has been lately examined by Admiralty experts with a view to the placing of work in that yard; and whether the Admiralty will consider the advisability of having repairs executed in Londonderry to His Majesty's ships stationed in or off the Irish coast.

---

† See page 462.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Londonderry Shipbuilding Yard was inspected in April, 1901, and, as a result of that inspection, was placed on the Admiralty Shipbuilding List for small vessels, and the Company has been invited to tender for several orders. A later inspection has taken place during the present year, and, in consequence of the reports received as to its capabilities, the Yard has now been placed on the List for the repair of hulls of vessels up to and including third class cruisers. The Admiral Superintendent of Naval Reserves has been so informed.

Port Erlin (Lough Swilly) Boat Slip.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any arrangement has as yet been arrived at by the War Department with the Congested Districts Board of Ireland with reference to the construction of a boat slip for fishermen at Port Erlin, Leenan Head, Lough Swilly.

MR. BRODRICK: In October, 1901, the Congested Districts Board asked and received permission to make a preliminary survey for the purpose of erecting a breakwater at Port Erlin. The survey is understood to have been made in March, 1902. No further communication, however, has been received from the Congested Districts Board.

London Street Traffic—Proposed Royal Commission.

*SIR J. DICKSON POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state what action the Government intend to take in connection with schemes for London locomotion; whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of London locomotion generally, and specially as to the advisability of appointing a body with statutory powers to deal with it; and if so, whether he will, pending the Report of the Commission, defer any action being taken in the matter. I may say that I only ask today particularly with regard to the latter part of my Question. The remaining portion was replied to yesterday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not imagine that it would be possible to appoint a body with statutory powers except by Act of Parliament. That would be a rather formidable undertaking, and I should not like to go beyond what I said yesterday in answer to the right hon. Gentleman opposite.†

NEW BILL.

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland).

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) in bringing in a Bill to amend the borrowing provisions of the Electric Lighting Act, 1882, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, explained that its object was to get over a difficulty which had arisen under the existing Electric Lighting Acts, and which was calculated to press hardly on local authorities. Under these Acts it was provided that the provisions as to borrowing powers should be on the same lines as in the Gas Acts, and unfortunately it had been ruled that where money had already been borrowed for gas purposes the amount must be taken into account with regard to powers for borrowing for electric lighting. That certainly was not the intention of the Act, and hence a short Act was necessary to remedy the difficulty.

Bill to amend the borrowing provisions of the Electric Lighting Act, 1882, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act 1890, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the borrowing provisions of The Electric Lighting Act, 1882, and The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

IRISH VALUATION ACTS.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed].

---

† See page 601.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 370.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of certain Annual Grants to Local Education Authorities in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to make further provision with respect to Education in England and Wales (King's recommendation signified), tomorrow.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 12:—

(2.40.) MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) said the matter referred to in the Amendment he rose to move had been to a certain extent dealt with by the alterations made in a former Clause; still he considered, with regard to joint committees dealing with two districts having matters relating to education, those committees should receive the direct attention and control of the education authorities. He believed that at the present time in county boroughs it was necessary that all the proceedings of the Education Department authority should be brought before the Council for adoption, but in the counties a different method of procedure was adopted, the Councils having power to delegate their authority to any committee, with such powers as they thought fit. If his Amendment were carried it would leave the law in regard to Education Committees to be appointed under this Section in the same position in all respects as it now stood.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 15, at the end, to insert the words '(6) The meetings and proceedings of any Education Committee constituted under this section shall be subject in all respects to the same provisions and regulations as those which now affect any ordinary or joint committees of any Council.'"—(*Mr. Luke White.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he gathered that the hon. Member's object had been more or less met by modifications already introduced into the Bill. Did he care to press the Amendment under the circumstances? The matter could, if necessary, be further dealt with in the schedule, but he was not convinced that it would not be better to leave it to the local authorities to deal with the point in the schemes they presented. He preferred the latter course, as it would leave room for such elasticity of arrangements as might be rendered expedient by the varied circumstances of the different localities.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that when the Committee discussed the question of the frequency of meetings and certain other connected subjects, it was understood—although the Government did not absolutely pledge itself—the matter should be raised on the schedule. If, however, his hon. friend preferred to press his Amendment to a division, he would suggest that the words "or joint" should be omitted from it.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked the Prime Minister if he could not expedite the presentation of the schedule dealing with the question of the frequency of meetings both of committees and managers. Since the point was last under discussion he had received letters from schoolmasters stating that their managers seldom if ever met. In one case there had been no meeting for twelve years, and in another for five years. As they had to deal with the remainder of the Bill in a hurry, it was desirable that right hon. Gentlemen should have the Government proposals without delay.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR replied that the request of the hon. Gentleman was not at all unreasonable, and due expedition would be shown in putting the schedule on the Paper. The statement as to the non-meeting of managers was, he believed, perfectly correct. As to the Amendment, he was still far from convinced that it would not be much better to leave it to the local authorities to arrange this matter by scheme. He could not, however, give any pledge.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) was very sorry to hear that, especially as they were to have a limited time for the discussion of the schedule. He urged the hon. Member to press the Amendment, in order that they might have the sense of the House. He also suggested that the words "or joint" should be left out, otherwise he would feel it his duty to move an Amendment to the Amendment.

MR. LUKE WHITE said he would adopt the suggestion to omit the words "or joint."

Amendment amended—

"By leaving out the words 'or joint.'"—(*Mr. Luke White.*)

(2.43.) Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 95; Noes, 150. (Division List No. 499).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Moss, Samuel
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Byrn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'thants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Luke White and Mr. Henry J. Wilson.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cranborne, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ry S Edm'nds
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickerteths
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt, Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milvain, Thomas
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Wodehouse, Rt Hon. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.) moved to leave out sub-Section (6), which is as follows—

> "In Wales and Monmouthshire any county governing body constituted under a scheme made in pursuance of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, shall be the education committee under this Act of the council of the county or county borough, unless any other scheme is proposed by the council."

and to insert the new sub-Section standing in his name. Those with whom he was closely identified fully appreciated the compliment paid them by the Government in respect of the admirable work done by the existing bodies in Wales, so far as the administration of the Technical Instruction Act was concerned, but he wished strongly to urge that they preferred that all education in Wales should come under one authority. The object of the Amendment was to avoid dual control. In Wales they should have one authority dealing with every section of education.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 5, line 16, to leave out sub-Section (6), and insert: (6) 'Any scheme for establishing an education committee of the council of any county or county borough in Wales or of the county of Monmouth or county borough of Newport, shall provide that the county governing body constituted under The Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, for any such county or county borough shall cease to exist, and shall make such provision as appears necessary or expedient for the transfer of the powers, duties, property, and liabilities of any such body to the local education authority under this Act, and for making the provisions of this section applicable to the exercise by the local education authority of the powers so transferred.'"—(*Sir Alfred Thomas.*)

Question proposed "That sub-Section (6) stand part of the Clause."

(3.0.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that as the Committee was aware, and as the hon. Gentleman had stated, sub-Section (6) was inserted in order to meet what were supposed to be the views of the Welsh Members in regard to bodies that had done admirable service for education in Wales in the past. Of course, the Government could not but welcome any change in the Bill that would put Wales in the same position as England in regard to education; and in the circumstances he would be glad, on behalf of the Government, to accept the Amendment.

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said he was sorry to have to introduce a discordant note. The change, however, which was proposed was of a much more serious character than many hon. Members imagined. The constitution of the bodies to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred in such generous terms, and which would be endorsed by all who were acquainted with the Welsh system, differed from the constitution of the education committees to be established by the Bill. The Committee might perhaps remember that he moved the omission of sub-Section (*b*) of Clause 12, which provided for the appointment by the council, on the nomination, where it appeared desirable, of other bodies, of persons of experience in education, and of persons acquainted with the needs of various kinds of schools. The county governing body in Wales which carried out the Welsh Intermediate system was constituted on somewhat similar lines; but there was one serious difference. The appointing bodies under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act were all of an undenominational unsectarian character. From a Return recently issued on the Motion of his hon. friend the Member for Denbigh Boroughs, it would be seen that the great majority of the members of the county governing bodies were appointed by the County Councils, the minority, representing other interests, being appointed by the educational bodies or by public bodies; and, in every case, with two or three exceptions, the educational body was the University College, the School Board, and not the managers of non-provided schools. It came out very clearly in the discussion on Clause 12 that it was the intention of the Government to have representatives of denominations on the education committees, as well as representatives of public bodies; whereas, under the Welsh system, which entirely excluded anything like sectarianism, there was absolutely no religious test whatever imposed. This had not prevented harmonious co-operation between Churchmen and Nonconformists. Indeed, the Bishop of St. David's had rendered most valuable services educationally, not only on the body with which he was connected, but also generally. Under the Welsh system, all denominational trouble was excluded from the schools; but now that policy was about to be reversed by the Government. If he had anything to do with the new Act, he would say frankly that he would gladly do his best to work it; but he looked forward with the gravest apprehension to working a denominational, as opposed to an undenominational, system, in that way. It might work well in England, but it would not work well in Wales. The number of denominational institutions was considerable; and if the policy of subsidising one religious body were adopted, the claims of other religious bodies would be irresistible. He could conceive no worse fate for education than that. He would not discuss the larger question as to how far undenominational education was hostile to religion. The question did not arise in Wales, because, whatever else might be said of that country, it could not be denied that it was predominantly religious; and no such trouble as was apprehended by hon. Gentlemen opposite would occur there. To abolish bodies with such a record, and which, not merely by the members who composed them, but by the manner in which they were constituted, were admirably suited for educational work would, he thought, be a very great mistake. He would conclude with an appeal to the Prime Minister. They all recognised the right hon. Gentleman's courtesy, and the manner in which he had conducted the debates on the Bill. They had had a few differences of opinion, which, however, did not interfere with their mutual respect. He was quite certain that the right hon. Gentleman did not desire to cause more friction or more trouble, or more administrative inconvenience than was absolutely necessary, and he therefore appealed to his hon. friend the Chairman of the Welsh Party, to whom he was sorry to find himself in opposition, to allow the withdrawal of the Amendment, and to the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw his acceptance of it. The withdrawal of the Amendment would still leave the County Councils with the fullest control of the county governing bodies. If a County Council felt that a county governing body was not capable of carrying out the additional work that would be imposed on it under the Bill, they had only to go to the Board of Education; and if, on the other hand, the Council were satisfied that the county governing body could administer elementary as well as secondary education, then the Bill would operate in the way that it now proposed. He would appeal to his hon. friend and to the right hon. Gentleman to allow the Amendment to be withdrawn.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) said he need hardly state that any observations with regard to Welsh education, and to the system now in existence for some years, which were made by his hon. friend the Member for Montgomery, would be listened to with the utmost respect by hon. Members on that side of the House, and, he believed, by hon. Gentlemen opposite also. His hon. friend had, since the Central Board was set up under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, ably presided over it; and the recent Report which was published showed what admirable strides had been made in regard to secondary and higher education in Wales during the last few years. But he thought his hon. friend was hardly justified in some of the observations which he had made with regard to the Amendment. The matter was not free from complexity and difficulty, and he admitted that it was only with reluctance that he would support the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for East Glamorgan. As the matter was one of some complexity, he might be allowed to ask the Attorney General whether the construction he would put on sub-Section 6 as it stood, and upon its effect, was or was not correct. The sub-Section stated that in Wales and Monmouthshire any county governing body constituted under a scheme made in pursuance of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, should be the education committee, under the Act, of the Council of the County or County Borough, unless any other scheme was proposed by the Council. Therefore, if the sub-Section were allowed to stand there would be two alternatives. One was that the county governing body became automatically the education committee under the Act. These bodies were made under the Act of 1889 conjointly with the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, and they dealt not simply with the rate that the County Councils were empowered to levy under the Act of 1889, but with schemes in reference to endowed schools and also considerable property under an arrangement with the Charity Commissioners. All these schemes went through the proceedings involved by the Endowed Schools Act; and had virtually the force of statutes. These county governing bodies were arranged not for elementary education but for secondary education. They were bodies which were not adapted to deal with the work which the education committees under this Bill would have to do. As he understood the effect of Clause 12 and the preceding Clauses of the Bill, the education committees would be practically doing the work which the School Board did at the present time. They would have to appoint the teachers, and in South Wales and Monmouthshire there were no fewer than 2,591 teachers in elementary schools who objected to be placed under the control of the county governing body. So much for the first alternative. He did not doubt that the county governing bodies would do their duty to elementary education, as they had done it to secondary education, but if he was asked whether they would do the work the School Boards were doing now, his answer would be in the negative. The other alternative was that if "any other scheme" was proposed by the county governing body—that was, a scheme under this Bill—there would be a new education committee, which would deal not only with elementary but also with higher or secondary education. Thus there would be a double authority. Therefore Wales was placed in a dilemma. His original view was that it would be better to leave out sub-Section 6, but there were grave objections to taking that course, and he thought the Amendment of the hon.

Member for East Glamorgan would be the best course to pursue, in order to preserve the Welsh system.

* MR. KENYON (Denbigh) said he was happy to think there was no very great difference of opinion between hon. Members on this question. The Prime Minister had tried to meet the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the course he proposed would obviate any difficulty that might arise under the sub-Section as it now stood. It was said the sub-Section should be deleted altogether. He did not think there was much to choose between the two courses, but whichever was adopted, it should go forth that it was not adopted from any feeling that the county governing bodies should cease to exist by reason of their failure to do the work which had been entrusted to them. There could be but one opinion as to those bodies which had done their work admirably. That statement might not commend itself to the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, whose appreciation of the Celtic fringe was not his strong point, but, with the exception of the noble Lord, there was no person who could say that, from first to last, these county governing bodies had not devoted themselves entirely to the improvement of education. He hoped in the future that would be put to their credit, and that whatever happened many members of these bodies might become members of the new bodies to be created by this Bill.

*MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) said several reasons had been advanced in favour of this Amendment. First of all, it was said that there would be a double authority, and secondly, that these authorities would have to do the work of the present School Boards. He did not think there would be a divided authority, neither did he anticipate—there would be any difficulty in the county governing-bodies discharging the duties of the School Boards, because by Section 15, the education committee had power to delegate to district or parish councils or other local bodies, the duties which it would have to discharge under this Bill. He saw no difficulty in the way of the county governing bodies of Wales discharging their duties under this Bill, and therefore he hoped his hon. friend would see his way to withdrawing his Amendment. No one who had any knowledge at all of the constitution and work of the county governing bodies could wish to see them destroyed, but if another body under this Bill was introduced into Wales and the county governing bodies were eliminated, an element would be introduced which would be altogether different from the Act of 1889. He thought if this Amendment were accepted, it would be contrary to the opinion of the great majority of the people of Wales, and that it would introduce into the Councils those denominational elements which would be very irritating to the people of the Principality. It was suggested that under the Amendment the County Councils would have the selection of the new bodies, but nothing in sub-Section (6) deprived the Welsh County Councils of the powers conferred on English County Councils by the Bill. The county governing authorities were only to be the education committees in the event of the County Councils not deciding otherwise, so that if the County Councils chose they could at once exercise all the powers and duties given under this Clause, so that the Amendment was comparatively valueless. If this Amendment were carried, and the Act of 1889 was permitted to remain in force, he did not know but what there might be two bodies in conflict. They knew exactly where they were with the county governing-bodies, but they did not know where they would be under the Bill. Upon the education ccommittee were to be persons nominated by bodies which were not defined, but which might be denominational, whereas there were no representatives of purely religious bodies on the county governing bodies in Wales. Those authorities had done excellent work for ten or twelve years; people of all shades of political and religious opinion acknowledged that the present arrangement had worked harmoniously, and it would be a great pity to abolish bodies which had done such excellent work.

(3.35.) MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) appealed to his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment. At first he was enamoured of the proposal to have one authority, but on further consideration he was convinced of its dangers. The present system had worked exceedingly well. He did not say there had never been criticism on the constitution of any of the county governing bodies, but there was certainly no strong body of opinion at all hostile to them or to the way in which they had administered the Welsh Intermediate Education Act. Under this proposal they were not exchanging one animal tested and examined for another similarly tested and examined; they were exchanging one tested for a pig in a poke, and as yet they did not know what shape the creature would eventually assume. If the scheme was to be framed primarily by the County Council, he would be disposed to accept it, but it was to be approved by the Education Department, and if the Department disagreed with the County Council, it was to be framed exclusively by the Department. It would be better not to make such a vast experiment so suddenly. Further, the schemes for the carrying out of the Act would be subject to the education committee, and in the last resort to the control of the County Council. That was a great safeguard so far as elementary education was concerned, because, even if a bad scheme were adopted and unsuitable persons pitchforked on to the committee, that committee would be subject, in regard to matters of elementary education, to revision and control in every respect by the County Council. But the action of that same committee would not be subject so far as the Intermediate Education Act of 1889 was concerned. That point had been completely overlooked. They were not so much afraid of the proposal as affecting elementary education, because they had confidence in their County Councils, but to make the Education Committee supreme in the other matters would be going much too hurriedly, and he therefore asked his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment so that the matter might be further considered.

Question put, and negatived.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put and agreed to.

Question proposed, "That Clause 12 as amended stand part of the Bill."

MR. WHITLEY said that since the discussion on the early part of the Clause he had taken the opinion of those most qualified to speak on matters of municipal and county government with respect to the effect of the provision that questions should "stand referred" to the education committee, and they confirmed his contention that the words would deprive the municipal or county authority of the power of dealing with any educational question except through the education committee. If a member gave notice of a desire to raise some broad question of educational policy, such as that insufficient attention was given to manual training in the schools, the words "stand referred" would compel the chairman of the authority to rule the resolution out of order. There would be nothing to compel the education committee to present a report upon such a question as that. With the words "stand referred" in the Clause the authority had no power at all, for it could only act by means of its education committee, and any group of ratepayers could not have direct access to the ear of the supreme authority. He thought the Attorney General might give further consideration to that matter and bring up some modification of the phrase, so that the authority should be supreme and not handicapped in that way. Then there was the question of nomination where it appeared desirable. In the composition of Technical Instruction Committees that plan had been tried and failed. There was no possibility of drawing any reasonable line as to what bodies should have a right of nominating. When the Chamber of Commerce claimed the right to nominate a member, the Labour Trades Council would also claim a similar right, and the thing would grow to such an extent that every local body would demand a representative, and the Council would be compelled to say that they would not appoint anybody except individuals qualified for the work, and refuse to have any outside nominations. This system of nomination had been tried and failed.

(3.50.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said that before they parted from Clause 12 he wished to make an appeal to the Government to alter its present shape before they came to the Report stage. If this Bill passed, he was sure that everybody would desire that it should be made workable. Setting aside the general principles for which they had contended, it was, in his opinion, impossible that the constitution of the committee of the County Councils could work if the provision stood as it remained at present. These County Councils would be called upon to form their schemes for their own committees, which would be the executive body of the County Council. They would form their scheme, and no doubt they would form it in accordance with their own judgment and the wishes of their constituencies, and they would have the right and power under their own scheme to carry out their own work according to their own view. That would be the natural condition of things. But what was to become of this scheme when it was formed? It was to be sent to an outside body, namely, the Education Department in Whitehall, for review and to obtain their consent; and what was this body going to do with the scheme of the County Council? Under the Bill they were to have an inquiry. The Council would nominate such persons as they thought desirable. But the Council might not desire to appoint. In this case there must be a conflict between the two bodies. They started with a dual authority. They had heard a good deal about a single authority, but the moment this Council met, it made its scheme and another authority was brought in to revise. They had totally changed the character of that body.

Let them consider how the thing worked, because really this was a question as to whether or not this scheme was going to be workable. They started by inviting the County Council to appoint its own committee. It would form its scheme and then it would be subject to revision and possibly to the overruling of another authority in respect to its constitution. If it appeared desirable to the Board of Education they would settle whom the rest of the committee was to consist of. He could not help saying again that this would be a great indignity to the Council, and they were starting their plan in a shape which was absolutely unworkable. No County Council would accept a scheme of that character. What was going to happen to their scheme? The words were that the Board of Education "may" have an inquiry. An inquiry for whom? What character was that inquiry to be? Was anybody to be able to come before the inquiry and say, "I have a right to be on the committee of the County Council?" This Inquiry was to be initiated not by the County Council, but by the Board of Education, and yet it was to overrule the County Council. They had entrusted technical instruction to the County Council, and they had not in the past imposed upon them conditions of that character, but had allowed them to act according to their own judgment. They were to have co-optation at the option of the County Council, but who was going to judge as to who were to be co-opted? It was quite plain under this Clause that it was not the County Council who would have the power of co-opting outside members. They would have a number of competing sects coming forward, all claiming to be upon the committee under the scheme, and the Board of Education would have to hold an inquiry into the matter. It would then, as he understood, be for the Education Department to amend the scheme, or to insist on the scheme being altered by the County Council according to their view of the various bodies claiming to be put on the committee. He ventured to urge upon the Government that before the Bill became law they should alter this condition of things, for he was perfectly certain that if the Board of Education forced on to the committee denominational representatives who were not desired by the local education authority, they would embroil the authority in religious difficulties at the very starting point. If the First Lord would tell the Committee that he did not mean that an outside authority should insist upon putting denominational representatives on this committee whether the County Council desired them or not, the objection he had made would be removed to a certain degree, but so sure as an outside authority attempted to put denominational representatives on the committee without the consent of the Council so surely would they cause a conflict at once and make the carrying out of the scheme impossible.

There were many members of the County Councils who were not favourable to undertaking this work at all. On the 5th of November this year the Right Hon. Lord Tredegar was in the Chair at a meeting of the County Council of Monmouth, when, by a large majority, a motion with reference to this Bill was carried. the concluding words being "that they respectfully inform the Government that if passed in its present shape, this Council cannot be responsible for its administration." Surely it was of interest to disarm this hostility so far as they could on the part of the County Councils. If this Bill were presented to them in a shape which practically took away from them the authority they were in the habit of exercising in the selection of their own committees, and if they were exposed to having their schemes overruled, they would not be very willing to undertake the work proposed to be imposed upon them by the Bill. He read sub-Section (*b*) as conferring a power to impose on them that which they had not chosen, they did not wish, and that which they would be very likely to resist. What would be the situation then of the education authority? There was no secret about it. What this meant was that denominational people were to be put on the committee, possibly against the wish of a Council which was not denominational. That was a most dangerous thing, and it was a thing which would make the Bill unworkable. He hoped that before the Clause came up again on Report the Government would reconsider the matter.

There was one other point he should like to refer to, and that was the way in which the Council were placed with regard to their authority, which the Government said was supreme. In this it would be very well if the Government thought fit to make some modification. The Clause provided that the County Council, which was the supreme authority, should not exercise any of the powers it possessed until it had consulted this Committee, except in cases of urgency. That was limiting the authority of the Council. Why was the Council not to have the power this House had of instructing its Committees? They should have power to instruct the committee in the general principles on which they desired the committee to act, leaving the details to the committee If the Councils were to be supreme, how could Parliament say that they were not to have authority to instruct their committees? It seemed to him that in this Clause they were cribbing and confining the Council to a degree which would destroy their authority and deprive them of the representative character which was claimed for them. The real representative authority should do the work which was confided to them. He believed the Government would make the Bill a great deal more workable if they took the shackles off the County Council which the Bill in its present shape imposed on them. That would do a great deal to remove the difficulties and objections which were strongly felt to the Bill. Above all, he implored the Government not to throw out this apple of religious discord at the beginning of the proceedings by imposing denominational nominees on the education committee.

(4.8.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I feel that it is due to the right hon. Gentleman to say a few words in answer to the speech he has made, and I will make these words as few as possible, partly because we have really discussed in Committee all the points he has raised in the speech we have just heard, and also because I think there are gentlemen in the House who are anxious to pass on to the consideration of the next Clause. I, of course, echo the wish with which the right hon. Gentleman concluded his speech. With him I earnestly deprecate the intrusion of religious controversy in these questions of education. I have kept them out as much as I can, but it cannot be done completely, I am afraid. I really do think, though I am not over sanguine, that if this Bill is given a fair chance it will be found by everybody, whatever the prevailing colour of his religious opinion, to work without any undue friction, or causing any undue religious bitterness. The right hon. Gentleman had a right to suppose that everybody concerned in this matter would be as unreasonable as possible. I agree that it is legitimate to put forward an extreme case. Let the Committee remember that it is an extreme case which the right hon. Gentleman has put forward. He supposed that the education authority would go to loggerheads with the Education Department; that they would send up scheme after scheme to the Education Department for approval, and that the Education Department would time after time refuse that approval until the machinery of a Provisional Order was called in, and the assent of this House was asked to a scheme not proposed by the education authority but initiated from Whitehall. I do not think that will happen. That is an extreme, and, I venture to say, an extravagant case; but even if we do assume it, remember that this Clause, in its present form, makes it perfectly clear that however recalcitrant the education committee may be it is the education authority that will be supreme. Suppose that it did happen that a scheme was forced on them unwillingly by the House of Commons: the County Council are supreme. They may not listen to the advice of the education committee they need not take their counsel; they are the judges of whether a case is one of urgency and whether the education committee are to be permitted to deal with it at the beginning. In these circumstances it does seem to me that the supremacy of the popularly elected body is absolutely secured by the Bill in its present form, and I trust when that is realised more completely than now, in those districts of the country where this Bill is looked upon with the greatest hostility, they will feel that popular control in its full sense is a great reality, and that they will endeavour, as Englishmen usually do endeavour, to make the best of the scheme, even if it is not the scheme which they themselves would desire.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: May I ask one question? Would it not be in the power of the County Council to constitute the committee entirely from its own members to carry out their own work, without any other persons being foisted upon them? That, I think, would be a fair test of their supremacy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, they would not, because a friend of the right hon. Gentleman put in a sub-Section which makes it absolutely obligatory that we should not rely upon the casual charity of County Councils, but should insist that one woman should be on the committee.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I except the woman. Apart from that, might they appoint a committee exclusively of their own members?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Barring the woman! That seems to me to be rather a large exception. No doubt they could send to the Education Department a scheme which included only members of the County Council.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Could they insist?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course they would not; I do not think that they would ever do it. [OPPOSITION cries of "Look at sub-Section (*b*)."] If the Committee asks me whether that is a very desirable plan, I should not be prepared to say, and what view the Education Department would take of it, I cannot, of course, say; but in that respect I think the matter is perfectly clear. I hope I will not be considered to have treated the right hon. Gentleman with scant courtesy. I have given a sufficient reply for the moment, considering the occasion, and I hope the Committee will consent to embody the scheme, as amended, in this Bill.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he would point out a matter which was of the greatest importance—viz., that sub-Section (*b*) was imperative. It said that every—

> "Such scheme would provide . . . for the appointment by the Council, on the nomination, where it appears desirable, of other bodies, of persons of experience in education, and of persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area for which the Council acts."

These words seemed to impose on the Board of Education that in making a scheme in accordance with the requirements of the Bill the committee must contain persons appointed by the local body. He must remark, in regard to what the right hon. Gentleman had said, that he did not think any difficulty would incur, that the right hon. Gentleman should remember that in these schemes the last word was with the Board of Education. It was they that were to decide. It was all very well for the County Council to make suggestions, but the Board of Education could overrule. There were some important parts of this Clause which had never been discussed at all. One of these was the provision for the creation of "other bodies, of persons experienced in education, and of persons acquainted with the needs of various kinds of schools in the area for which the Council acts." Now, that proposal was justified on the ground that experts were wanted on these committees; but there were good experts and bad experts. The worst kind of expert, however, was the expert who had an axe to grind, and that kind of expert seemed to be contemplated by this Clause. What they gathered from the attitude of the Government that day, was that persons were to be put on the committee to represent particular interests of their own. Could any simpler method be employed of importing dissensions into these bodies than that persons were to be appointed on them, not to promote a common object, but a particular object which he was sent to promote? The County Councils had many faults, but they had one merit, that the members were elected on general considerations because they were the men who commended themselves to their fellow-citizens. That was a principle which this Clause denied and over-ruled, and on that ground alone the Committee should object to it. There was another part of the Clause which had passed without discussion, and that was the provision for passing a scheme by means of a Provisional Order. He thought that that method was eminently unsuited to the case. Still more important was the provision of sub-Section 3, which directed that any scheme might provide for the constitution of separate education committees for any area within a county. Now, that was a provision which would be largely taken advantage of, but how would it work? The right hon. Gentleman took refuge in the argument that the deciding voice would rest with the County Council and not with the local committees. Take the case of Devonshire. Any one who knew that county must be aware that it would be quite impossible for the County Council at Exeter to exercise a direct and constant supervision over the whole of that county. He apprehended that the County Council would appoint a local committee for the north-west district at Okehampton, for the south-east district another committee at Bampton, and for the south-west district still another committee at Kingswear or Dartmouth. How would that work in with the system which the right hon. Gentleman contemplated under this Clause? They could not find a sufficient number of county councillors to constitute a majority on these local committees, and the consequence would be that the County Councils would practically have to devolve on these local committees the great bulk of its work, and that work would be very heavy. It would be impossible for the County Council at Exeter to keep abreast with what was being done by these local committees, to have that knowledge of their proceeding, or of the local requirements of the separate areas which would enable them to deal with all the questions constantly arising. The consequence would be that the County Council would be obliged to ratify the decisions of the local committees. and that these local committees would do the work which, in the view of the right hon. Gentleman, the County Council was set to do. He felt that if they tried to body forth the actual working of the system proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, it would be found that it must be entirely different from that which was in the too sanguine mind of the right hon. Gentleman. He felt very strongly that if the Committee had been able to discuss this subsequent Clause relating to the local committees they would have introduced most valuable and important Amendments into it. They had, however, lost that opportunity. Wherever they had had the opportunity of discussion they had succeeded in transforming a Clause, or of bringing in a new Clause altogether, which, by the common consent of the Committee, was a great deal better than the original

Clause. They would be deprived of that opportunity now, and in the future, and therefore he parted with this Clause not, he was afraid, in a very sanguine spirit. He parted with it with a sense of the imperfection which the Bill would have if it did not receive that thorough, complete, and searching investigation in Committee which its importance required. He believed that from time to time they should have more and more occasion to regret that proper time had not been given for the discussion of this crude and imperfect measure.

(4.30.) MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W. R., Keighley) pointed out that, though the County Council would have a very large amount of new work placed upon them under this Bill, there was no provision of money for that purpose. They were now called upon to deal with evening schools and the education of teachers, and no provision had been made for that. It would be impossible in his opinion to carry out these duties unless there was money provided. He also suggested the desirability of the local education authoity having power under the Charitable Trusts Act, with regard to the submission of schemes.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS did not think that the Prime Minister or the Committee could complain of the short discussion on this Clause. It was the turning point of the whole Bill, and if the Clause was not workable the Bill would not be workable. No doubt the intention of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister was that under this Clause the new education authority should be supreme, and if that was the real state of things no one would be dissatisfied. but nothing of that kind was provided in the Clause. As the Clause now stood, the position was this, that the education committee was a committee which had been created for the first time, and for which there was no precedent. There were all kinds of committees under our system of local government, the powers of which ranged from something very nominal and advisory to practical independence in relation to the authorities out of which they were carved. There was nothing in this Clause to say in what position this committee stood, yet this was the machine that was to work the Bill. There was nothing to show how the machinery was to work. It was impossible to show where there was any control over these committees except in the power to raise a rate. It had been said that the power of spending money would remain with the County Council, but that did not appear to be so in this Clause. The local education authorities could not delegate the power of making a rate or raising money, but there was nothing in the Clause which vested the spending power entirely in them. The education committee could still spend the money and call upon the County Council to raise a rate for the purpose of paying it. He challenged the Attorney General to point out where there was any indication at all of any power over these committees. There was no doubt that the Bill, when drafted, contemplated very much greater power being given to these committees than it was now suggested they should possess. It was intended that the drafting should be so vague as to enable these committees to have the great power that it was desired they should have, but the opinion of the Government had been changed owing to the pressure put upon them. They had an instance of how these committees were going to work, because an Amendment had been moved which provided that these education committees should stand upon the same basis as all other County Council Committees, but the Government refused to accept it. If a pledge had been given that they should not be able to spend money, where was the difficulty in accepting that Amendment? The right hon. Gentleman had expressed his opinion that something of the kind ought to be done, but he said it ought to be done in the schedules. The right hon. Gentleman was asked to pledge himself that it should be done in the schedules, but he declined to do so. That alone should make the House pause before accepting the Clause as it stood, and if they accepted it they should consider it very seriously before they came to the Report stage. As to the constitution of the committee, the plan of the Government was not co-optation. It simply forced the County Council to go outside their own body in order to get people to administer the Act as members of the education committee. He contended that the "other bodies" intended in this Clause were the diocesan associations. In the event of a County Council refusing to alter a scheme, in accordance with the directions of the Education Department, recourse would be had to a Provisional Order, so that by this procedure the last word would not be with the Department, as they had been told it would be, but with the House of Lords. By this means representation of diocesan or other bodies might be enforced against the wish of the local authority, giving rise to constant friction undesirable in the interests of education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR made an appeal to the Committee that the debate upon this Clause should be reduced into the narrowest compass, in order that the Committee might get to Clause 13, on which he understood many hon. Members desired to speak.

*SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said it was inherent in the constitution of a Committee of a local governing authority that it had power to appoint sub-committees; the education committee, therefore, would have that power. Many County Councils would find it would be infinitely more convenient to appoint one education committee than a number of such committees.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They can do that under this Bill.

*SIR JOHN BRUNNER asked whether that being so, it was in the power of an education committee to co-opt for the sub-committees. The amount of extra work thrown on County Councils by this Bill was very large, and would be found to be irksome unless they were allowed to bring to the service of the sub-committees, through the power of co-optation, all the local experience and local goodwill possible.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the Secretary to the Board of Education, assuming that the Clause would give the Education Department the power to insist on the representation of diocesan or other bodies, what policy the Department proposed to pursue? The hon. Gentleman was, after all, the gentleman who would have to see to the working of this Measure, and, that being so, he (Mr. Robertson) would like to know what he intended to do. Had he considered this question? Would the Department force sectarian representation, or would they leave a Council a free hand?

*SIR WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said the Committee had been informed by the Prime Minister that the School Board system was, so far as the authority was concerned, a very complicated system. The right hon. Gentleman had referred in strong language to the absurdity of the Cumulative Vote, and he had claimed for this Bill a simpler form of administration. By the present proposals there would be more circumlocution and more processes to go through before the authority was constituted than had ever been connected with the School Board system. He could not but believe that there was some other ground for the Government proposing so difficult a plan than the simple question of the administration of education as a whole. There was not that motive power in the Clause which would enable education to be carried on in the future so well as in the past. A process of filtration through all these bodies was to go on, with the result, he feared, that no one would be responsible for efficient education in any school area in the country. Up to the present the School Boards had been so responsible, and because there had been a great motive power at the back of their working—pride in the knowledge of the subject and the determination to make their schools the glory of the district—they had erected a standard of education which had been the admiration of the world. Where, under this Clause, was there any motive power to cause such a condition of things to continue? The Government appeared to have mistaken altogether the purpose of the Bill in this Clause. What was required was a greater motive power than before—in fact, an inspiration on the part of some to raise the quality of our education—at any rate to a standard equal to that prevailing in many other countries. While the Committee were speaking so much about provisos and checks they were whittling away the only force now existing—the sense of responsibility and the knowledge of the subject—and constituting a local education authority which would be a myth or shadow, having no power over its committee when constituted, nor that motive force which would enable it to do its work well. He was unable to conceive why the Government, from an administrative point of view, should have so complicated the constitution of the authority. In the Netherlands the system was simplicity itself. They had there the same vexed question as here; the denominational feeling was very strong; but the law provided that schools should be found for all the children without distinction, and the whole of the system was carried out by the mayor of the town, an alderman of the Council, two or three councillors and a secretary. That was the whole administrative authority, and at its discretion it could constitute sub-committees and delegate to them certain powers with regard to details. He should despair of ever arriving at that state of things under this Bill; there would be no motive force at the back of education, and on these administrative grounds he strongly protested against the Clause.

(5.8) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked, supposing provision was made in each county in Wales, on the nomination of the representatives upon the joint body, for the purpose of supervising primary education throughout the whole of Wales, whether that would come within sub-Section (3). Could the provisions of the Central Board be extended for primary education under that sub-Section, and representation upon that body provided for?

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): That would be possible under sub-Section (3).

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE then pointed out that, with regard to the county governing bodies now to be abolished, there was a provision for the representation of School Boards, and he asked how the School Boards as constituent bodies would be represented now the School Boards were to be abolished? On the advisory body there would be, say, twenty-seven members, of whom fourteen would be appointed by the County Council, who would represent the School Boards or the provided schools in nominating their quota of the remaining Board members? Provision was made for the representation of the voluntary schools. But voluntary schools were in a minority in Wales, and was provision to be made for the representation of the minority while none was made for that of the majority?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON was understood to say that the local education authority would have to make provision for the representation of persons interested in the education of the children within the area. They would choose their own method, and if the School Board managers thought it was not the best that could be suggested they would make their suggestion, first to the local authority, and then, if necessary, to the Board of Education, who would bring the matter back to the local authority and ask them to reconsider their decision.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was rather important. He wanted to know the view of the hon. Gentleman because powers of legislation were being entrusted to him with regard to these schemes. Would the representatives of the local authority be regarded in the future as the representatives of the provided schools, because if so, popular representation was being cut down in favour of the denominational schools. As he understood the hon. Gentleman, in addition to the representatives of the local authority, he would insist on the provided schools being represented——

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I must not be understood as saying I would insist on anything.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was just the difficulty. The Committee were passing a clause without knowing exactly what was in the mind of the hon. Gentleman. The representation of the voluntary schools was to be insisted on, and the

Committee were entitled to know whether the hon. Gentleman would insist also on the representation of the provided schools. Then there was the question of proportion. Was it the intention to swamp the county authorities with representatives of the sectarian schools? What was the notion of the Government with regard to the respective proportions? As the education committee had been converted into a committee of the County Council it was essential for the success of any scheme that there should be confidence between the committee and the body to which it had to report.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said if it was to be understood that the Board of Education must have the final voice in the constitution of the scheme appointing the Education Committee instead of the County Council, then in that case under heading (*b*) of sub-Section 2, if the Government would consent to alter the words they would thereby very materially lessen the opposition to this Clause. He asked the Government to consider whether, on the Report Stage, they could not rearrange the words to read—

> "For the appointment by the Council, where it appears to it desirable, on the nomination of other bodies."

That would give to the Council the right to decide how far it was necessary to go outside its own body to secure a fair and real representation of those interests which it was the object of the Government to include. He would refer to the statement just made by the Prime Minister that a scheme might be presented by a local authority almost entirely composed of members of the County Council, and this, if representative of other bodies, might be approved by the Board of Education, so he would ask that the words, "Appointment by the Council of at least a majority of the committee," should be so amended as to convey clearly that the County Councils might exercise their own discretion and choose how many co-opted members it should have. Take the Lancashire County Council, which had over 100 members. There the Technical Instruction Committee had worked well together in the past. They had on the committee the Ven. Archdeacon of Blackburn and also a well-known parish clergyman who was Chairman of the Agricultural Committee. Where they could secure a *bonâ fide* representation of that sort of sectarian interests from amongst themselves, it was well that the authority should have the power to do so. On the Lancashire County Council they had gentlemen elected by the people from various walks of life, many of them with university degrees, and yet occupied in commerce. They had representatives who were members of the Church of England, and others who were Nonconformists, as well as Roman Catholics, working side by side, and so all the interests they desired to consider in the working out of the education scheme were represented. He appealed to the Government to say that on the Report Stage they would clear away this difficulty. If the Government would recognise the strong feeling both inside and outside of the House to give the local authority the right and power to determine who should serve on their own Education Committee and alter the Clause by introducing the words "to it desirable," he thought they would be doing a great deal to ensure the successful working of the Clause.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he was sorry to add anything to the length of the debate. Appeals had been made to him by hon. Members on the other side upon a matter to which it was practically impossible for him to give an answer, namely, the policy of the Board of Education in respect of these schemes. He read this Clause to mean that the object of the scheme was, that all the educational interests of the area should be represented. Sub-Clause (*b*) required that two sorts of persons should be on the committee representing education, one class being "persons of experience in education" and the other "persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area for which the Council acts." It was possible that the Council might contain such persons within its own body. If it did not they might be provided from elsewhere and selected by the Council, or they could be appointed upon the nomination of other bodies. He had been asked what would the Board of Education do if the Council did not put on a proper proportion of representatives of various educational interests. His view was the Board of Education should act by way of suggestion rather than of constraint, but there was no doubt that the Bill gave power to act to the Board of Education, and if such action was called for the Board would have to deal with each case according to the circumstances attending it.

Mr. M KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that in the framing of these schemes it appeared to have been overlooked that there would be two education authorities in many counties, side by side, namely, that of the county and that of the non-county boroughs of over 10,000 population, and urban districts with a population of over 20,000. Under this proposal there would be no representation of the county authority, and they would have two education authorities dealing with education, within the area of the county. Instead of taking care that experts and sectarians should have been represented, the Government should have taken care that the education authority of the non-county boroughs and the county boroughs should have had interchangeable members. In Lancashire there were no less than thirty non-county boroughs of over 10,000 inhabitants, and urban districts of over 20,000. Consequently there would be an education authority representing the County Councils, and thirty different authorities representing non-county boroughs and urban districts. Absolutely no provision was made to prevent the very evil which they were told this Bill was designed to put an end to. Surely the Government could not be really proposing that this Clause should leave the Committee in this form without any assurance that they intended to alter this state of things. Nobody who had studied the Bill could have the slightest doubt that this Clause, as it stood, would be productive of the most hopeless confusion. Even in the county of Cornwall there were some ten or eleven subsidiary education authorities, all acting through independent committees, and no single member of the County Council or any representative of the central education authority was made compulsorily a member of any of those subsidiary committees. Under those circumstances he submitted, even at this late stage, that the Committee would be unwise in allowing this Clause to go through in its present form.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said he wished to remind the Committee that perhaps the most important provision which ought to be made in this Claues was the co-ordination of elementary and secondary education. The Secretary to the Board of Education put down on the Paper an Amendment to the effect that the Board of Education were not to give their consent to a scheme unless they were satisfied that due regard had been had to the importance of co-ordinating elementary and secondary education. So far as it went that was sufficient to meet what could be done in this Clause, but owing to the operation of the Closure the hon. Member did not move his own Amendment. He desired to ask the hon. Gentleman whether between now and the Report stage he could see his way to devise some plan which would give more elasticity to the Clause in this respect. Since by an unfortunate accident that agreement had not been given effect to in this Clause, he thought he might hold himself free to ask that before the Report stage of the Bill was reached the Government would consider whether some form of words could be adopted which would make sure that co-ordination would be carried out.

(5.28.) Question put, "That Clause 12 as amended stand part of the Bill."

Committee divided:—Ayes, 259; Noes, 138. (Division List No. 500.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James

Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHn. J.A.(Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lowther, Rt. Hon, James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr. E. C (Monagh'n N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)

Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,RtHonHerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren,Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. JohnWilliam
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,RtHon.John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Palmer, GeorgeWm.(Reading)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reid,SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt Hn.C R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merth'r
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 13:—

(5.45.) *THE CHAIRMAN: In regard to the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Sleaford I would like to ask how he proposes to meet the deficiency which would arise if his Amendment were carried?

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): My proposal is to limit the burden on the rates; and it is not for me to say how the deficiency is to be met.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the right hon. Gentleman confines himself to arguing that the expenditure should be kept so low that one-fourth only should be raised from the rates, and that the remainder should be obtained from Parliamentary grants, then the right hon. Gentleman would be in order; but if he goes on to say that the Parliamentary grant should be increased in order to meet the new charges under the Bill, then he would not be in order.

Mr. CHAPLIN said that in moving his Amendment, which proposed to limit the expenditure out of the rates to one-fourth of the whole expenditure on education by the education authority and the expenses of the authority, he wished to recall to the minds of hon. Members that a deputation, representing a great number of bodies in the country, waited on the Leader of the House on the 15th of June last, in order to urge upon him that the cost of national education should be borne from the national Exchequer, and not from the local rates. His right hon. friend on the 24th June made a financial statement to this House, during which he said that the Government were prepared to make an additional grant of £900,000 for the purposes of education. In making that grant elementary education was solely contemplated, and in no case, it was said, should the Exchequer pay more than three-fourths of the cost of education. That was a recognition of the justice of the case presented to the right hon. Gentleman, and they were duly grateful for it. But since that time very considerable changes had been made in Clause 2, which provided for secondary education. Not only that; the further information on the subject which had been developed during the progress of these debates has led to the belief in his mind and in that of others, that unless they were to be weighted in the future with a much larger burden on the rates than they had ever contemplated, that provision would be altogether inadequate.

He hoped the House would allow him to say a word both on secondary and elementary education. He would take the question of secondary ducation first. The position of secondary education seemed to him to be the weakest and most unsatisfactory part of the whole Bill. It might be contended that the creation of a very effective system of secondary education was probably of more importance than any of the questions they had been so long discussing. They were all agreed that such a system should be established, but where they differed—and he desired to say this particularly—was as to the provision which was to be made for the expense of secondary education and the sources from which it was to come This was really very important when they came to consider what secondary education meant. What was meant by secondary education, as he understood it, was to give to all the more promising of the rising generation the opportunity, after they had gone through the elementary course, of extending their studies in higher education. Of course, in the great centres of population, that was comparatively easy, but take the case of the county he represented, Lincolnshire, formerly one of the most prosperous counties in the kingdom, but now, owing to the agricultural depression, the most impoverished of all. That county contained a very large number of villages, widely scattered, and with few centres of population. How were they going to provide secondary education usefully in a county like that? They would want buildings, as a matter of course, and buildings, too, of some importance. But how many of them? for, after all, they would be of very little advantage unless they were reasonably near to those who are going to use them. And if they were going to provide this education entirely out of the rates they would wish that the schools should be within reach of the people; otherwise they would be favouring one locality to the disadvantage of another. If they were going to set up efficient secondary education in such districts as he had been describing, it was certain that the outlay must be very considerable indeed. He asked again where was the money to come from? It must be remembered that what was called the whisky money was nearly all spent already, so that, as a matter of fact, anything additional which was to be spent on secondary education in the future must come out of the rates. Well, then, there was the question of the training of teachers. Nothing was more necessary or more important, as he could not see how they could have an efficient system of education without that. But why should the cost of training teachers be placed on the rates? He would turn to another point. The right hon. Gentleman said the previous night, in the course of debate in reference to Clause 2, that that Clause, which was originally purely permissive, had emerged out of these debates practically mandatory both in regard to powers and expenditure. Now, he thought that was right, but he should like further information on the point. If his right hon. friend was right in saying that the Bill imposed a very definite duty in regard to secondary education on the local authority, he wanted to ask—did the local authority as regarded secondary education, come under the powers of the Board of Education, as laid down by Clause 11 of the Bill? That Clause ran as follows—

> "If the local education authority fail to fulfil any of their duties under the Elementary Act, 1870 to 1900, or this Act, in any part of their area, the Board of Education may, after holding a public inquiry, make such order as they think necessary or proper for the purpose of compelling the authority to fulfil their duty, and any such order may be enforced by *mandamus.*"

If the local authority was to be subject to the Department of Education in this way, then he maintained that even in regard to secondary education they were imposing an added grievance, and an added burden on the local authority. Either this Clause was compulsory or it was not. If compulsory, they were imposing something which would be intolerable from the ratepayers' point of view. If not compulsory, then he held that the best part of the whole Bill was likely to be an absolute dead letter, and they would be no better off than they were before.

But whatever might be the case in regard to secondary education, there was no doubt in the world that this Clause applied to elementary education. Well, the Education Department had very great powers, and the local authorities as regarded elementary education had very distinct and definite duties to perform. They would have to maintain all the public elementary schools within their area in an efficient state. But who were to be the judges of that efficiency? The Education Department were to be the judges; it rested with them to fix the standard of efficiency, and if they were dissatisfied they were to step in and insist on further action being taken by the local authority whenever they pleased. That duty would devolve on his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education. He was a new broom, and they knew that new brooms swept pretty clean, and he might be very reasonable, but some day the position might be very different. When that did come he should thank his stars that he was not a member of the Lincolnshire County Council; otherwise it might not be long before he found himself in Lincoln jail by a *mandamus* of the Education Department because he did not feel it his duty to inflict a sufficiently heavy rate upon the county. It seemed to him that there were some districts in which great difficulties would arise—districts in which there were a great number of schools, Board schools practically, with insufficient buildings. There was no real power to compel the owners of denominational schools to meet the requirements of the Board of Education with regard to buildings. True, the grant could be withheld, and the school converted into a provided school; then the cost of maintaining the school and providing the buildings would also fall upon the rates; but if that process was often repeated in one district there would be a tremendously serious addition to the rates. It might be that it was rather more likely that this Bill, instead of having the results that it was hoped and intended it should have, would ring the death knell of a great number of denominational schools throughout the country, rather than prolong their existence, as was intended. That would mean unlimited burdens upon the rates. This Bill should have contained more ample provision from Imperial funds. The Government were pledged against introducing measures which would increase the burdens on agricultural land, but that would be the effect of this Bill. They were making the ratepayers the milch cow for education, but sometimes the milch cow turned restive and kicked over the pail. He had not heard what these increased burdens were to be. He had heard that they would range from 4d. to 9d., but he had made no calculation, because to him that was no real criterion of what was going to happen in the future. He was apprehensive, and they had had many warnings in the past with regard to this matter. Mr. Forster in his Bill had declared that the rate would never be more than 3d., and now in some cases it was 2s. 9d., and that was under Mr. Forster's Act. The tendency of expenditure was to increase, and he wished to place a definite limit upon the burden. The Government proposed that the Imperial contribution should in no case exceed three-fourths of the whole expenditure. He wished to propose that the rates should in no case exceed a quarter of the whole expenditure. That was the only satisfactory safeguard against an indefinite increase of the burden upon the rates in future. The burden upon the rates for a great national purpose such as education should not exceed a fixed limit in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the words 'expenses of a Council under this Act,' and insert the words 'expenditure out of rates under this Act shall in no case exceed one-fourth of the whole expenditure on education by the education authority, and the expenses of that authority.' "—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'expenses of a Council' stand part of the Clause."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was probably owing to the ruling of the Chairman before his right hon. friend rose to speak that he did not fully understand what plan it was desired to substitute for the plan proposed by the Government. His right hon. friend's speech really resolved itself, so far as he could gather, into a lamentation over the Bill in consequence of the additional cost that it appeared to throw upon the rates. It was a general statement of his right hon. friend's feelings upon the subject of local burdens. He had great sympathy for him and for those for whom he spoke. It had never been denied in any quarter of the House, never on the Government side of the House, and least of all by the Front Government Bench, that the ratepayers of this country did in many respects suffer from the present position of the law, and that many burdens were thrown upon them which might, from the abstract point of view of strict equity, have a wider distribution among all classes of the community. If his right hon. friend wished to impress that fact on the Committee, he had nothing to say against him. He felt, however, that his right hon. friend had been a little inclined to forget how much had been done by the Party to which both he and the Government belonged to relieve the burden of the rates out of the general funds of the community. Without attempting to give full and accurate details of the great contributions to local rates out of the Exchequer made since 1887, it was sufficient to say that the State contributed £6,000,000 additional to the Local Taxation Account, £1,300,000 in respect of the Agricultural Rates Act, about £600,000 in respect of the voluntary schools, and about £200,000 in respect of board schools. Further, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or his predecessor, had promised between £900,000 and £1,000,000 in order not merely to make up for any losses which the general community might have to bear under this Bill owing to the drying up of a certain proportion of voluntary subscriptions which were now some £600,000 or £700,000, but to more than make up for those losses by a great deal. If the right hon. Gentleman had remembered that all these forms of assistance to the rates had been devised and carried out by the Party to which he and the Government belonged, he would not have thought the Government open to the charge of indifference to the interests of the ratepayers, whether agricultural or otherwise. The Government had even received a great deal of obloquy from the fact that part of the relief it had extended to the rates was devoted to that class of the community for which the right hon. Gentleman spoke. The hostility to that measure of hon. Gentlemen opposite was, he understood, by no means exhausted; and they meant to go to the country with the non-renewal of the Agricultural Rates Act as the principal plank in their platform. He only drew attention to the fact that the Government had a right to recognition of the fact that they had shown themselves in the most practical sense to be the friends of the ratepayers in this matter, and he rather thought that the right hon. Gentleman would find in the election address from which he had quoted a very specific reference to the interests of voluntary schools.

As to the right hon. Gentleman's specific proposal, he was a little puzzled, for it made no appearance in the right hon. Gentleman's speech, and if it had done it would at once have been ruled out of order. He did not know how to answer an Amendment which was either out of order or without meaning. The Government in this Clause could not alter the obligations which it found already imposed on the ratepayer for the purpose of education. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the Government had invented in this Bill the responsibility of the ratepayers for elementary education. That was not so. The obligation was there already. The need for improved and organised education was admitted on all hands; and what could the Government do more that accept the situation created for them, and aid the ratepayers by a large and generous subvention? The right hon. Gentleman might have treated the efforts of the Government in a more generous spirit. He seemed to think that the gift of £1,000,000 more, in addition to the £9,000,000 which was already given to elementary education, was a relatively small contribution. It was neither small nor insignificant, but the Government would like to see it made even greater, if it were practicable; and the fact that a certain sum had been put down in the new Clause by no means precluded the possibility of making a larger contribution from the Exchequer to the cost of this national duty. He could not pledge himself on a matter such as that; but the Committee would take it as sufficient if he said that the Government were anxious to increase the very large grant they were already making. Whether they could or could not carry out that intention must depend on general circumstances which it would be improper to refer to at that moment. The expression of this hope, which was something more than a merely pious hope, should convince the right hon. Gentleman that the Government were by no means indifferent to the great interests on behalf of which he had spoken. The Amendment, however, was wholly impracticable. The earlier portions of the Bill threw a duty on the ratepayers, and it was impossible to do that and say that the funds for carrying out the duty should be rigidly and artificially limited.

*(6.25.) **Sir EDWARD STRACHEY** (Somersetshire, S.) said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that this was not a practical Amendment, and that if it were, it would have been out of order. But the Prime Minister might have made the proposal himself, in which case it would not have been out of order. The right hon. Gentleman further said that the Government were in great sympathy with the agricultural ratepayers in this matter, but although they sympathised with their position, there was no means of giving relief. No doubt something in the past had been done to relieve the inequalities of taxation, but the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to impose a fresh and heavier burden on these very people. Relief was given under the Agricultural Rates Act. He supported the Third Reading of that measure, on the ground that at that time of great depression, the agriculturists were suffering very heavily indeed, and had the first claim to consideration. But he only voted for the proposal after the operation had been limited to five years, in order that the whole incidence of local taxation should be revised there in the interest of all classes of ratepayers. The whole question of local taxation was then to be considered, and a Royal Commission was appointed. What, however, was the right hon. Gentleman doing? He was increasing the burden on the occupiers of land and houses, and it was made the worse because, under the Agricultural Rates Act, any increase of local taxation would fall more heavily on the men living in the small towns. He, therefore, strongly urged on their behalf the absolute necessity of this additional rate being limited to one-fourth of the total amount that they would have to pay for national education. Another point was that the clergy had been relieved also. In their case the money did not come out of Imperial Exchequer contributions, but out of the Local Taxation Account. Here the same thing would happen, and what the Government had given with one hand they would take away with the other. The Prime Minister had not attempted to defend the imposition. He assured the right hon. Gentleman there was a very strong feeling on the part of both Liberals and Conservatives that the Bill placed an unfair burden upon the ratepayers, and that the very least that should be done was to lay it down in the Bill that in no case should the ratepayer have his rates raised by more than one-fourth of the total cost of education in any area. Members had not the slightest idea what this rate might be, and those who opposed the Amendment

might have cause hereafter to regret having done so if the rates increased considerably. It was useless to say they ought to be grateful because they would be relieved of their voluntary subscriptions. As a voluntary subscriber he had no wish to be relieved of the payment of his voluntary subscriptions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not say that.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he understood that to be put forward as a reason for gratitude on the part of voluntary subscribers, but if the right hon. Gentleman disclaimed it he would withdraw that remark. He desired, most strongly to support the Amendment on behalf of every class of ratepayer.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) confessed that he was much troubled as to the future of our educational system. His right hon. friend had at any rate made it clear that the Bill would not tend in the direction of economy, although he was not an advocate of cheese-paring economy, he would point out in regard to Clause 11 that certain obligations were thrown upon the ratepayers, but if they attempted to exercise economy the central authority would come down upon them and force them to spend the money. A great deal was heard about subventions and contributions of the State to supplement local resources. He had always objected to the principle of such grants. Imperial funds were handed over to a local body; in other words, other people's money was given. That was an unsound system, and one that was fatal to economy. When his right hon. friend committed himself to the policy of giving to the local authorities the charge of education in their districts, he was in hopes that there would be a chance of retrenchment and economy. The sums spent were enormous. In addition to over £9,000,000 contributed by the taxpayers, there was, according to one Return, over £3,000,000 from the rates, and certainly £800,000 from voluntary sources. How were those enormous sums apportioned? All Members desired to maintain the Army and Navy in an efficient condition, but they did not call in experts like the noble Lord the Member for Woolwich to determine the amount of the Navy Estimates. But in regard to education they allowed enthusiasts—he would not use the stronger terms that were often employed, such as "faddists," "doctrinaires," and so on—to fix the price the ratepayers were to pay. What his right hon. friend the Member for the Sleaford Division appeared to want was almost equally dangerous. According to him, if the local authority found themselves in financial straits, they were to go to Downing Street and get whatever balance they required. Economy was knocked on the head, and it was time the House set itself to work to institute some kind of effective control over the enormous sums annually raised for educational purposes. He would not go into the question of whether the State aimed at too much in its educational programme. He would, however, be sorry to commit himself to the view that we got value for our money. Many of the subjects taught were not suited to the position in life of those being educated; that had been admitted over and over again by the most ardent educationalists. The *status quo* was pre-eminently bad; he only hoped this Bill would not make it a great deal worse.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) thought that most Members would agree that education was a national service, and ought, therefore, to be treated, in the main at any rate, as a national charge. But he would not go the length of the First Lord, who apparently suggested that we might ultimately arrive at a stage at which the whole cost of education would be a national charge.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

DR. MACNAMARA was glad the right hon. Gentleman dissented from that view, because he thought it was desirable that a margin of cost should be met by the locality, as otherwise they gave themselves over to bureaucratic government and did not allow the locality any voice in a matter which was distinctly a local concern. He would consider for a moment the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford. Although it might not involve any additional Treasury grants, it was reactionary to a large degree. This Amendment did not cast any obligation upon any locality to rate itself at all, and if it were carried a number of localities would get off very well indeed, for they would be able to wipe off all their voluntary contributions. If this Bill was to do any good at all they must make this rate universal, otherwise the schools would suffer. At the present time there was a very large area without any local rate, indeed, there were seventeen boroughs, ninety-two urban districts, and 5,000 parishes with no rate at all. Only that morning he had read an account of a meeting of the district Chamber of Agriculture, where one of the speakers said he regarded it as a hardship in being called upon to help to educate other people's children after he had educated his own. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] If that was the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite he would remind them that this Bill insisted upon that as a communal obligation. That was the position taken up by the representatives of agriculture. The same speaker at the meeting of the Chamber of Agriculture declared that it was all very well to tell the farmer that he would probably have a seat on the Board of Management, but that would not help him to pay the rate. The chairman of that meeting also spoke in similar terms. That was a fair and reasonable description of the attitude of the agriculturists. Perhaps he might be allowed to quote the opinion of the late Vice-President of the Council upon this point. By way of answer to the fears of the agricultural interest that the Bill would impose a heavy burden upon farmers, he recommended some words uttered by the late Vice-President of the Council, where he suggested whether the "better education of the people would not tend more to the relief of agricultural depression than remedies like bimetallism or Protection." "The understandings of all those who are connected with the cultivation of the soil," the late Vice-President added, "appear to be dark."

The first thing they had to do was to take care that districts which had not been rated before should now be rated everywhere, and he suggested that the only statesmanlike policy to be adopted was that to which he had referred. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford imposed no obligation upon these authorities to rate themselves, and it left them a chance of escape. The proposal was that they were not, under any circumstances, to raise more than one-fourth of the entire charge of education by way of the local rates. He did not know whether that one-fourth was to include all charges. If it included the amount of liabilities which were now outstanding, amounting to £20,000,000, and all other sorts of capital and loans, then the contrast he had to make was even more striking. He would assume that with regard to maintenance, they would never have to meet more than one-fourth out of the local rate. He understood that it was not the intention to reduce the efficiency of Board Schools. The rates for Board Schools were about £3,750,000, or 45 per cent. of the maintenance charge in those schools. The Imperial Exchequer grants amount to £3,500,000 or about 50·8 per cent. The £1,000,000 promised by the Government would reduce the proportion contributed by the rates to about 35 per cent. Then they had got to bring in the fact that they were going to double the number of children who would be educated out of the rates, but he did not in the least complain of that. That would bring the proportion back again to about 45 per cent. of the entire cost. Now the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford proposed that this proportion should never be more than 25 per cent. Therefore this Amendment would reduce it in a most material way. Was that the intention of hon. Members opposite under a Bill which professed to make further provision for education? This policy would be disastrous to education. He thought he had proved that in a rough sort of way. It would dry up at the very outset any development of higher education; and, although they were all desirous to get the great bulk of the money from the Imperial Treasury, they must not put the cart before the horse in this matter. If this Amendment were carried, it would reduce enormously the amount available for educational purposes, and he therefore preferred the more wise and liberal proposal of the Government. What the Government said was, "We will make you spend one fourth all over the country, and if you do not we will reduce your Government grants until that proportion is reached." That was a policy in accordance with wise statesmanship.

(7.0.) MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said the point that was now being discussed was one of the most important in the Bill. From the educational point of view, nothing could be worse than to lay down such conditions that they were not likely to have a good educational system. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford took, as an illustration, the proposal to put on the rates the charge for the provision of training colleges for teachers. Could they have any better method devised than this for not having colleges properly provided and equipped. It was impossible to say that this was a local matter. If there was one matter which more than another was national as against local, it was the training of teachers for the national schools. Therefore, from the educational aspect, it was extremely important that some alteration should be made with regard to the proposals of the Government in dealing with the expenses both of secondary and primary education. He would deal first of all with the question of principle. The Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation had been quoted with approbation by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, but if he had really appreciated what that Report meant, he would never have made a speech advocating that, as between the rates and Imperial sources, there should be an obligation on the ratepayers to find a quarter, and if they did not find it, there should be no contribution from the Imperial Treasury.

DR. MACNAMARA said that what he stated was that the service being national, the great bulk of the money should come from Imperial sources, but that there should be a margin to secure economy of administration to be raised by a rate levied locally.

MR. CRIPPS said he did not disagree with what the hon. Member said now, but that was entirely inconsistent with his advocacy of what he said was the Government proposal. What was the problem? He did not agree with his right hon. friend the Member for Sleaford that this was a matter which interested agricultural members particularly. It was a ratepayers' question, and ratepayers were found in towns as well as in agricultural districts. There was a universal feeling in the urban districts that it was unfair to put what he might call the additional risks of education upon the rates. The provision of primary education was admittedly a national service; and when a national service was to be administered locally the delicate and complex question arose, how much of the cost should be provided from the national Exchequer and how much from local resources? What the Royal Commission on Local Taxation said, referring to education, was that where a national service was administered locally the ratepayers at the present moment had to pay more than their fair share of the cost. What was proposed in this Bill with regard to the risks to the rates in future? He did not find fault with the part which distributed the old School Board rates over the country districts, because he quite agreed with the Prime Minister when he said that these rates already settled that liability, and that it was only a question of distribution over the larger area. So far as the distribution over a larger area was concerned he thought that was one of the greatest improvements of the present Bill, because they could not have anything more unjust than the placing of a local charge for a national service on such a small area as a country parish. That was manifestly unfair.

He came now to what the Bill really did with regard to imposing possibly new burdens on the ratepayers. All the additional expenditure for education under the Bill would be incurred entirely at the risk of the ratepayers, and that was absolutely in the teeth of the opinion of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. Parliament not only placed this national service upon the local authorities, but determined the amount of the expenditure upon that service. There was no doubt that this Bill properly placed on the local authorities a minimum standard of education which was settled in this

House through the Education Code. Where there was a national service, and the expenditure upon it determined by Parliament, surely the funds, apart from the question of margin, ought to be provided by the national Exchequer. What was the present principle on this point? It was said that they could only guarantee that result in future by placing on the body responsible for the increased expenditure, the burden of finding the additional necessary cost. That was a true principle. If, of course, the minimum standard of education was to be fixed locally very much might be said for allowing the people who fixed the standard to declare also what ought to be the price. They not only compelled the people to carry out a national service, but proposed the additional hardship of making them pay for it whether they liked it, or wanted it, or not. The real principle was that which was laid down in this Amendment—that the risk of the additional expenditure should be thrown on the shoulders of those liable for its being incurred, and not on the shoulders of those who were bound to incur it whether they liked it or not. It should be borne in mind that, while 1d. in the pound on the rate produced only £700,000, 1d. in the pound on property liable to the income-tax produced £2,500,000. This meant that as much as £430,000,000 of what he might call the ascertained property of the country escaped all contribution towards the local burden of taxation for education. The ratepayer could not feel keen about education when he knew that he had to contribute 4d. for a national service which if placed upon the national Exchequer would cost the taxpayer only 1d. What they were wrong in doing was in putting this new charge, which would be created for the first time, on the localities; and now was the time for those who believed in the principles laid down by the Royal Commission to make their protest. The matter had been very carefully considered, and after that careful consideration there was an unanimous recommendation on this point. There was a time when that recommendation ought to have been regarded and enforced by the Government, but they had put it on one side, and had placed an undue burden on a class already excessively burdened both in town and in country.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire) said he wanted just to say a word or two with reference to the attitude of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, who had been very ably representing the interests of the elementary teachers throughout the country. The hon. Member had not been representing, and could not claim to represent, the interests of the ratepayers. In speech after speech the hon. Gentleman had said that he did not mind whether the rates went up or not, and he hoped that the ratepayers would feel the burden. What he wanted was sufficient education. But the hon. Gentleman was a London Member, and his constituents were not going to pay one farthing of this increased burden.

DR. MACNAMARA said the hon. Member was not representing him by any means correctly, but he would say precisely the same thing in regard to London as he had said in regard to the provinces.

MR. PHILIPPS said that what he had to consider was the interests of his constituents. The right hon. Member for the Sleaford Division proposed to put a certain amount of this burden on the taxpayers. They all knew that education had got to be paid for somehow, and the right hon. Gentleman was in a difficulty owing to the forms of the House. If his Amendment were carried the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have to find the money next March, and directly it came to taking a farthing from his constituents the hon. Member for North Camberwell was against it It was to be hoped that some of the agricultural Members would make it uncomfortable for the hon. Gentleman with his constituents. He did not share the views of the right hon. Gentleman, the Member for the Isle of Thanet. He was in favour of educational efficiency. He was an enthusiast on the subject of education, and wanted to see more money devoted to it. But they all admitted that the expenditure under this Bill for education was going to be a great deal heavier than ever before. The right hon. Gentleman, the First Lord, said that the

Government were giving £900,000 extra under this Bill, and that would meet entirely the voluntary subscriptions which would be withdrawn. That might be so, but he believed that under this Bill the expenses of education in the country districts would go up enormously. At present the administration was local, and they all knew that under local administration expenditure could be cut down in a hundred different ways without diminishing efficiency. But now, under this Bill, they were to put the whole thing under one authority in the county. Up to the present time, supposing a teacher wanted an increase of salary he had to get it from the local School Board, who would have the fear of their constituents before them and of being beaten at the next election for extravagance. In the case of Board schools and voluntary schools there was, therefore, a strong pressure in the direction of economy. But if all education were put under one authority it would be absolutely impossible that one authority would be as economical as many little authorities. He believed that under the Bill there would be a great deal of unnecessary expenditure on small items. Like the hon. Gentleman who spoke last, he believed that the increased expenditure ought not to come on the local authority, but should come from the general taxpayers of the country. Education was a national business, and the great part of the expenditure ought to be paid by the general taxpayers. For that reason he was entirely in favour of the Amendment. The Government were not making themselves popular with the ratepayers by this Bill; certainly not in the case of the Nonconformist ratepayers. But there were other ratepayers than Nonconformists who did not take much interest in ecclesiastical disputes, but who would be compelled to take an interest in this Bill, because their rates would increase under it for years to come.

* MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said the hon. Member for Stretford had put in clear and beautiful language all that he wished to say on this question; but he wanted to emphasise the view that this was not solely an agricultural question. Although he was not an agriculturist, he had the greatest sympathy with the views expressed by the right hon. Member for Sleaford. He believed that the agriculturists in this country had had a very hard time, but there was no greater nonsense than to contend that the technical education of working men could be a remedy for agricultural distress. All that was utter rubbish. All that technical education could do as regards the agricultural labourer would be to turn an efficient working man into an indifferent clerk. There were many constituencies where the people were very poor, and these should not be called upon to find the money for what was really a national charge. He agreed with a good deal of what had fallen from the hon. Member for Tamworth. He thought that some part of the expenditure should fall on the rates, as it did at present, otherwise no motive would exist for economy; but where he especially agreed with his hon. friend was that the money should be so distributed between voluntary and other schools that each should have their share of the rates already existing; and that no increased burden whatever should be cast on the ratepayers of the country. He was not an educational enthusiast. He believed that a majority in the House and in the country were education mad, and those who were education mad and not the unfortunate local ratepayers ought to be made to pay the piper. To his mind their duty was to help the denominational schools, which taught the children their duty to God and man. For these reasons he was in hearty accord with what he conceived to be the general principles of the Bill, and he thanked the First Lord of the Treasury for his sympathetic speech.

*MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said that in his reply to the right hon. Member for Sleaford, the Prime Minister gave a promise that at some future time he would give a contribution in aid of the ratepayers out of the Imperial funds. To his mind, however, a bird in the hand was worth two in the bush, and he thought that if this Amendment had the effect of causing that contribution to be made immediately it would be a very good thing indeed. He supported the Amendment on the ground of educational efficiency. He was one of those people who thought that the more money that was spent on education the better, but at the same time he believed that the more money provided out of the rates for education the worse it was for education. They had only to consider the complaints that had been made in days gone by in regard to the small rural School Boards.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 13:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the words 'expenses of a Council under this Act,' and insert the words 'expenditure out of rates under this Act shall in no case exceed one-fourth of the whole expenditure on education by the education authority, and the expenses of that authority.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'expenses of a Council' stand part of the Clause."

*(9.0.) MR. SOARES, continuing his speech, said that when the sitting was suspended he was pointing out that if a large proportion of the money to be expended on education was to come out of the rates, it would be a bad thing for education. He gave as an instance those "rural School Boards" which had, to his mind at any rate, been unjustly attacked in the House for their inefficiency. They had always been told these School Boards were inefficient, because the managers preferred low rates or no rates rather than educational efficiency. They did not wish to see those principles applied to the education committee about to be appointed. They must remember that County Council elections in the future would be very much more stiffly fought than they had been in the past. He, for one, was very much afraid that if one candidate for the County Council had on his programme Low rates and Not so much education, and another High rates and Good education, the first would succeed. In his opinion by far the greater portion of the money to be expended on education should be borne out of the Imperial Exchequer. He quite agreed that the locality ought to bear some proportion. The locality ought to bear such a proportion as would ensure due economy. Education was a national subject. A clever, well-educated young man was, to his mind, a national asset, and not a local asset of any sort or description. If in a country district a young man received a good education and proved to be a clever fellow, unless he had capital it was no good his remaining there; he probably went to a town where he could get good opportunities of making a success in life, and the town got the benefit of the money expended on his education and not the country district. He was sure that if rates were materially increased by this Bill they would fall very hardly indeed on the agricultural portion of the community. It was true that last year was a good year for the farmers, but as a matter of fact he knew that farmers hardly made a bare living out of it, and many of them did not succeed in making interest on their capital. He would admit that under the existing circumstances any increase in the rates was bound eventually to fall on the landlord. For the first few years, however, he did not believe it would fall on the landlord. It in fact only fell on the landlord when there was a re-valuation for rental purposes or when there was a change of tenancy. They had proof of that in the working of the Agricultural Rating Act. Whenever there was a re-letting or re-valuation the whole benefit at once went to the landlord.

MR. JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): How do you know that?

*MR. SOARES: I learnt it from the farmers in my constituency. He had also a very high authority for the statement as well, for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford said on one occasion that when rates were high rents were low, and when rates were low rents were high. After all this was one of the elementary rules of political economy. A farm could only produce a certain amount of profit per annum; a portion of that went to the landlord as rent, and the remainder went to the tenant as interest on his capital and as a reward for his skill and labour. But if they were going to increase the amount of the rates, who was to bear that loss? For the first few years it would be the tenant, and under the existing circumstances of agriculture the tenant could not afford to pay. But after a time the landlord would have to bear the loss. Seeing that at the present time landlords had a majority in the County Councils, he thought everybody would admit these gentlemen would be against increasing the rates. He heartily supported the Amendment, and meant to vote for it.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said the discussion had been conducted with a view to finding a means of putting the cost of rural education upon the taxpayer in boroughs, transferring what ought to be the proper local share to a part of the country where it had not been incurred, and where it certainly ought not to be artificially raised. The first objection to this proposal was that it was totally inconsistent with the policy upon which the finance of education had been conducted ever since State aid was given for education. Down to the present time the theory of the matter had been that education was a matter of local concern, and the contributions which were made by the Exchequer were contributions of assistance towards the discharge of the local duties. For the future, apparently that point of view was to be entirely ignored. The contribution of the State had increased during living memory first to one-third, then to half, and now to a sum not exceeding three-quarters, and this was an attempt to make the State the paymaster of the whole cost of education, for the sake of some districts where there was no sincere interest in education. In the towns there was an active and sincere interest in education. The ratepayers desired that education should be thorough. They believed it was a national as well as a local interest. The proposal before the Committee was a retrograde one. The system heretofore had been that the national and local interest in education should be stimulated by contributions which were required for the purpose from the local authority, and to make local education efficient, first by providing a system of inspection, and then by providing substantial assistance out of public funds. If the present proposals were carried, the Clause would be accepted as a declaration of Parliament that the policy to be pursued in the matter was to prevent local authorities from indulging in any enthusiasm for education and to warn them that if they were enthusiasts, they should take care not to contribute more than a farthing in the penny.

*MR. SOARES: And get everything else necessary from the Imperial Exchequer.

*MR. DUKE: Of course they were to have confidence in the unlimited generosity of the Imperial Exchequer. He had no sort of sympathy with people who wanted education without paying for it, and he had a great deal of repugnance towards any tendency for charging the costs of education in one part in an unequal rate upon the taxpayers in another part of the country. If the burden was to be a national one, and there was to be no check upon local contributions, it should be an equal burden all over the country. That was not what was proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford. It was not fair that residents in boroughs and persons interested in commerce should be made to contribute more largely to Imperial taxation than dwellers in the country. Let them have a consistent policy in this matter. If education was to be a national burden, let them face it and impose safeguards, but do not let them have the local authority masquerading as enthusiasts for education, and procuring the benefits of education without any cost to themselves. The inevitable result of that would be extravagance in the local and rural authorities and dissatisfaction among the urban authorities, with consequent serious damage to the cause of education.

*Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) said he viewed education as a national question, and one that should be kept outside Party politics. The Prime Minister ought to bear in mind it was his duty to legislate for the whole nation, without consideration for any Party, religious or political. Referring to the speech the Prime Minister had delivered earlier in the evening, the hon. Member remarked that he rubbed his eyes when he heard the Prime Minister describe himself as a benefactor to the ratepayers. He thought at once of his own constituency. In the case of Llanelly, one of the two boroughs which he had the honour to represent, a calculation had been made for the year ending 29th September last, which showed that under this Bill on the poor-rate assessment there would be earned an aid-grant of £2,658, whereas under the present law there would be earned £3,041. Here was a loss of £383. How then could the Llanelly ratepayers regard the First Lord of the Treasury as a benefactor? He declined to accept the right hon. Gentleman as a benefactor until he knew of some action of his which would justify the title. If he wished to be a benefactor let him tax ground values and royalties for the purposes of education, and let him divert the three million doles from parsons and landlords to education. There would be severe punishment to the Tory Party at the next election on account of this Bill, but if the rates increased under its enactments, as there was every prospect of their doing, then the punishment would be still greater. Injustice marked every line of the Bill. He would not have the Prime Minister imagine that the feeling of the country against the Bill in this House was represented by the Opposition; on the contrary, the feeling in the country was ten times stronger than that shown upon this side of the House. The Bill might have been introduced and carried a hundred years ago—at the commencement of the nineteenth century—but it was lamentable that on the dawn of the twentieth century, in an enlightened age, such an unjust Bill should be forced through the House. He felt that there was never a better or stronger case for the Liberal Party to fight for. If only they could have William Ewart Gladstone with them for one week, the Liberals would drive the Tory Party out of office. He could not understand why Members opposite did not make up their minds to appeal to the country on the question. The Colonial Secretary had stated on the previous night that he had no objection to appeal to the country if (there was always an "if") other duties did not prevent. He hoped it was clearly understood that many good and noble men would let their goods be sold and would suffer imprisonment rather than pay the rates. He therefore urged the Government to pause before it was too late rather than force through the House a Bill which would cause a revolution in the land.

Mr. JOHNSTONE said the hon. Member who last spoke had given them a discourse on the general iniquities of the Bill, but had hardly touched on the point under discussion. He very greatly regretted that this Amendment should have been moved by a right hon. Gentleman who had, in the past, identified himself so largely with the agricultural interest in that House. The right hon. Gentleman had done a great deal for the agricultural interest, but he could not think he was doing it a good service when he brought forward this Amendment. Some years ago, a Bill was introduced by the right hon. Member for Sleaford, which very much reduced the assessment of agricultural land for the Poor and other rates. He supported that measure, because he believed it to be one of absolute justice. But, having obtained justice, he did not think it behoved those who represented the interests of agriculture to come to the House continually and plead for sympathy or compassion. He would like to hear from the hon. Member for Barnstaple who were the wicked landlords who had put into their pockets advantages which the tenants ought to enjoy, or who had raised their rents on those advantages conferred by Parliament. He knew of no such case, and he doubted if one could be produced for the edification of Parliament. The rating of agricultural land was, to his mind, placed on a fair basis under the right hon. Gentleman's Act of 1896—a basis which he thought the House would never upset or interfere with. Having thus obtained justice, let them be satisfied, and not come to that House on every conceivable occasion and say they were ground down, that they were oppressed, and could not live on account of the burden of rates on their shoulders. Curiously enough, on the preceding Sunday he was turning over the pages of a county history and he noticed that in 1801, in three parishes near where he lived now, the parish rate was 9s., 6s., and 5s. respectively. Nowadays the average rate in rural parishes in England does not exceed 5s., and seeing that agricultural land was assessed at half its value, he did not think they ought to have that eternal cackle about the rates being too high. There were other things, no doubt, which pressed heavily on them, among them the facilities for borrowing which had been given to the spending authorities, who thus increased their burdens. When the question of education was at stake, he did not think they ought to ask for any better bargain than they had got under this Bill. He could not altogether agree with the arguments of the hon. Member for Barnstaple that the benefit of the money spent on education in several districts was lost because a young man went off to the town to make a living. In many cases they came back to spend the money they had earned, and therefore the expenditure on education was a good investment. County Council elections were not always to be turned by cries of low rates. Much depended on the candidate, and if he were a man who enjoyed the confidence of the people of the district he would get elected, so long as he declared for economy with efficiency. His opinion was they had very much overridden their horse of high rates. It certainly was not dignified or to their credit, and he did not think it was to the interest of agriculture to reiterate the plea that the rates were too heavy to be borne and should be placed on the shoulders of other persons.

(9.30.) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said that the debate, in some parts of it at least, had been on the incidence of taxation rather than on the Amendment before the Committee. The incidence of taxation was a very important question, which ought to have been dealt with by the strongest Government of modern times before now; but it was not a proper topic to discuss on the present Amendment. He represented a purely agricultural district, and he regretted that, therefore, he was compelled to dissociate himself from some of his hon. friends who found it incumbent on them to support the Amendment. He did not believe that if the Amendment were passed, it could possibly obtain one penny from the Imperial Exchequer. It was a law of Parliament that no such Amendment would be in order, or that under it a penny could be obtained from the Imperial Exchequer for the purpose of reducing the cost of education throughout the country and relieving the rates. Therefore, the result of the Amendment would be that less money would be spent on education, and that education would be less efficient in the country districts. Whatever view the agricultural interest might take on the question, he for one was not prepared to purchase votes by promoting inefficient education. That was the principle on which he stood. He felt, however, that the expense of carrying out one part of the Bill might very properly be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. He referred to the secondary education part. The Prime Minister said, on more than one occasion, that it was necessary to provide for the more effective training of teachers; and he felt that that, too, was, very properly, a national and not a local charge. But as regarded elementary education, he was quite sure that the principle in the Bill was a just one, and that the locality should bear some part of the expense. He was very anxious that no Amendment should be passed which would prevent efficient education in the rural districts. He was perfectly well aware that children in the agricultural districts were placed at a considerable disadvantage already, through the want of proper educational facilities. The appliances and the teaching staffs were very inefficient, as a rule, because of the want of sufficient expenditure, and his view of the Amendment was that if it were carried less money would be spent on education. Therefore he was not prepared to support it, even though it might be regarded as an attempt to relieve the rates. Before the introduction of the Education Act of 1870, the contribution from the Imperial Exchequer was fixed at one-third. It was afterwards advanced to one-half, and now the right hon. Gentleman claimed that not more than a fourth should be paid by the ratepayers in the locality. He was rather surprised that his hon. friend had not looked with greater suspicion on the Amendment, coming from the quarter it did. The right hon. Gentleman was not in favour of educational progress unless it could be obtained free of cost; and, looking at the character of the support which the Amendment had received, he was quite certain that its aim was not educational efficiency. In these circumstances, he hoped the Committee would negative it by a large majority. He was quite sure that if they put the advantages of education before the rural districts that they would find a response, although it might be slow. If the interests of agriculture could only be promoted by the means suggested in the Amendment, then, indeed, as an industry, it was very near its lowest ebb. He opposed the Amendment as one which could not possibly reduce the burden on the ratepayers, while it would, in some ways, prevent the spread of education on the lines they desired throughout the agricultural districts.

*SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said he felt it difficult to give a silent vote in regard to the Amendment; and he made no apology for trespassing on the Committee for a few minutes, because, after all, the question was a very important one, which should not be put lightly aside. They were all agreed that some of the burden in connection with education should be put upon the locality; and it was perfectly obvious that, from an administrative point of view, there should be such a charge. In the first place, some of the chief powers would be taken away from the new authority if they had no funds to dispose of; and therefore, from a common-sense point of view, some charge must rest on the locality. His right hon. friend moved the Amendment to safeguard the agricultural interest in particular from the possibility of an indefinite charge on the rates. The Amendment was, in his opinion, an impossible Amendment as it stood. He had had the honour of carrying one or two Bills through the House connected with education; but he never, in his wildest dreams, thought of placing a Clause such as the Amendment of his right hon. friend in any of them. They were dealing with the indefinite in connection with the rates which would have to be paid under the Bill. Neither those who framed the Bill, nor those who had given it the closest attention, could tell within 1d. or 2d. or 3d. what the ultimate cost would be. He would venture to suggest to his right hon. friend not to proceed to a division on the Amendment. He would give a practical reason for that suggestion. They had had a speech from the Prime Minister, who was in charge of the Bill, and if that speech had been unsympathetic, as regarded any proposal for a further charge on the Imperial Exchequer, he would have recommended his right hon. friend, as a protest, to divide on the Amendment; but that speech was sympathetic to a high degree, and although the Prime Minister, very properly, could not pledge himself that, in the future, further relief would be afforded, although he gave no direct promise, he at all events indicated that what had been already done would not be a bar towards further relief in the same direction. Surely, from the business point of view, they could not secure a better situation in connection with the question at issue. He was one of those who believed that the estimates made of what the cost would be under the Bill were much exaggerated. His right hon. friend the Member for Thanet, who looked upon him as a faddist in matters of education, said that the cost would be unlimited, and that there would be extravagance on the part of the local authorities. Nothing of the kind. The local authorities had been dealing with an education problem up to the present which was far more difficult than they would have to solve under the Bill. The Bill would do away with the foolish extravagance in the past, whereby money was spent on elementary education without any guarantee that that education would be continued. Extravagance such as that would be once and for all abolished. Then, with regard to the rate, it was perfectly true that there might be a rise, and even an abnormal rise, in some districts; but the increased rate would be an investment that would bear good fruit. When a school was improved, when a popular master and mistress were introduced, the immediate result was a considerable rise in the attendance, and a consequent improvement in the grant; and that addition to the grant must be balanced against the rate before they came to the net result. He desired to point out to hon. Members who were puzzled as to how they would vote, to remember that a great deal of pressure would be put on the Government in the future to afford further relief where a very heavy charge had been incurred and serious injustice inflicted, and that that pressure would be irresistible. Therefore, looking at the whole situation. he was perfectly satisfied to let it rest as it was, coupling with the speech of the Prime Minister, the certain pressure which would follow if there was an undue increase of the rates in any district—pressure which would be so great that relief must come. He believed that the whole result would be that there would be a fair balance between the charge from the Imperial Exchequer and that proper charge which ought to come from the local rates. If his right hon. friend went to a division he would vote against him, although he had the greatest possible sympathy with the cause he advocated against the piling up of rates to an unjust extent, whether in town or country.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said he was extremely suspicious of the quarter from which the Amendment proceeded. He was also somewhat timid of the hon. Baronet the Member for South Somerset, and whenever he heard in the speeches of the hon. Baronet an allusion to the Central Chamber of Agriculture, it always threw him into a state of perturbation. The hon. Gentleman took as his text the Amendment, but the gist of his sermon referred to another matter altogether. The Amendment itself was fairly harmless and innocuous. He did not think that any hon. Gentleman would object to some limitation being placed on the rates; but the right hon. Gentleman argued the matter simply from the standpoint of the agricultural interest. The hon. Gentleman's argument was one which was somewhat familiar to the Committee. They had heard it previously, and it amounted to this—that although local burdens might increase, and although other people might be rated, the agricultural interest should go free. He did not, however, think that the hon. Gentleman could argue that in agricultural districts rates bore with very great severity. The average rate on agricultural land was from 1s. to 1s. 3d. in the £; whereas rates in towns were from 6s. to 10s. in the £. The matter was one which affected all kinds of rating; and one which ought to be discussed simply from the standpoint of agriculture. The proper principle was that where they had increased local burdens, all rateable property should contribute equally. Surely the hon. Gentleman could not contend that a farmer, who only paid one-twentieth of his full rateable value, suffered more than a person who had to contribute one-half. The hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division alluded to the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. The hon. and learned Member took a prominent and eminent part in the deliberations of that Commission, and he was sure they would all support the hon. and learned Member if he could only persuade the Government to legislate on the lines of that Report. That was the real solution of the question; and until that was done, discussions such as the present would crop up from time to time and be as useful in the future as they had been in the past.

Major RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) much regretted that the Amendment had not the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Dartford Division, and could only suppose that the agricultural depression had not reached the somewhat suburban constituency he represented. He hoped it would not be long before it did.

*Sir W. HART DYKE: I have had twenty-seven years of it.

Major RASCH said in his constituency they always had it. He thanked the First Lord of the Treasury for permitting a certain amount of additional discussion of this Clause and for the sympathetic allusion he had made to what might possibly happen in a few days. If he might venture to suggest a fault in connection with his right hon. friend's management of the Bill, he thought that his right hon. friend might have selected the principle of short speeches instead of that of closure by compartments. Things were very different now from what they were when the First Lord of the Treasury addressed them on the 26th of June, when he promised them a subvention in aid of the rates. They were in a very much worse position now than they were then; and, although it was only four months ago, it seemed almost pre-Adamite. Secondary education was then permissive; it was now going to be compulsory. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no.] As far as his limited intelligence could guide him, he believed it was going to be compulsory, but he would drop that. With reference to the voluntary schools, by a sort of hocus-pocus which he could not understand, they were to be called "provided" schools in certain circumstances, in which case they too would come on the rates. That was another reason why they should have the sympathetic attention of the First Lord of the Treasury. They stood in a very different position now from that in which they did when the Bill was read a first time. Now they had a new Chancellor of the Exchequer, and there was a good deal in that. At that time, he himself was in the position of Athanasius against the world. He had no friend in the House from an educational point of view. Now things were different. *The Times*, which used to refer to himself and his friends as rustic individuals, harmless faddists in the matter of education, and all that, had come round to their side in reference to the rates on the land, and what *The Times* said today most sensible people, at any rate, thought tomorrow. That was his experience at all events. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth rendered valuable assistance on the Second Reading of the Bill with reference to this particular matter. He had never thought that the right hon. Gentleman was opposed to the agricultural interest, although he was charged with it. Another right hon. Gentleman, rather late in the day, at the eleventh hour, almost at a quarter to twelve—he alluded of course to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Sleaford Division—although he voted for the First and Second Readings of the Bill, now came and gave them what support he could. Of course, every little helped, and it was better late than never. He was reminded, with reference to the right hon. Member, of the anecdote of Lord Chesterfield and Dr. Johnson. Hon. Members would know to what anecdote he referred, and he need not pursue the reference. [HON. MEMBERS: Quote.] The anecdote was simply this. When the great lexicographer was struggling with the difficulties of bringing out his dictionary, he called on Lord Chesterfield, who kept him waiting in his ante-room a long time and did not after all give him a satisfactory answer. When the initial difficulties had been overcome Lord Chesterfield came to his assistance, and Dr. Johnson said he was not of as much use to him as if he had been there a little earlier. The support of the hon. Members for Oldham ought to be his, for, whether they knew it or not, they were the apostolic successors of one of the greatest of Englishmen—William Cobbett —who said in the House of Commons that he would never put a tax on agricultural land for the purpose of education. He wished to know why the Government could not give a grant of 42s. 6d. for each child; and if people were fools enough to spend more, that would be their fault, and not the fault of the Government. There was no reason why the agricultural interest should be slaughtered to make an educational holiday. He failed to understand the feeling of some hon. Gentlemen on this matter. The hon. Member for Wigan was an enthusiast, even a fanatic, on education. He believed the hon. Member would be quite satisfied if every farm in East Anglia went out of cultivation if he were allowed to put a denominational school on its site. The agricultural interest in this House was long-complaining and long-suffering. They did not make half as much noise as they might about their grievances. They did not ask for doles or loans, and, if they did, they knew perfectly well they would not get them. All they asked was that they should be treated fairly and honestly. He was afraid he had spoken too long on this particular question, and he hoped hon. Members would pardon him for having done so. He represented a constituency almost entirely agricultural; where his supporters were divided into two camps—those who were ruined and those who were going to be ruined; where the rates were absolutely crushing; and where they were at their wits' end to make a living. The only way in which he could justify his continued existence as a Member of the House was by standing up, as best he could, for the men who sent him there.

(10.0) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he congratulated his hon. and gallant friend on having kept within his own rule as to a time limit, even on a subject in which he knew he was deeply interested. It was the highest tribute he could pay to the value of the principle he had preached in the House. He only rose now to suggest to the Committee that the debate on this Amendment might now come to a conclusion. He thought his right hon. friend who moved the Amendment might be content with the interesting debate he had initiated—a debate which had dealt adequately, he thought, with the important matters his right hon. friend had raised. He ventured to suggest that, as the terms of the Amendment were hardly of a kind which the House as a practical body of legislators could accept, his right hon. friend might consent to withdraw his Motion.

MR. CHAPLIN said he might be permitted to say a few words in reply to the appeal of his right hon. friend. His right hon. friend urged him not to press the Amendment; on the other hand he had been urged by a great many people from all parts of the country to press it to the utmost. If he did not press it, what could he tell his friends and supporters? Had his right hon. friend offered anything specific? He did not think he had. Did his right hon. friend give any distinct promise of any further grant? He gave his sympathy, and he was perfectly sure that his right hon. friend was thoroughly sincere in that; and he thought he understood his right hon. friend to hold out some hope—[MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear]—that he might be able to render assistance later. If his right hon. friend would tell the supporters of the Amendment that they might entertain a reasonable expectation that another year, if not this year, unless unforeseen circumstances arose which put difficulties in the way of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he might be able to come forward with some further help in the direction he had indicated, he would be ready to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was always very anxious on such occasions never to say anything that could be twisted into a pledge. It was absolutely necessary that pledges should be fulfilled, and he always endeavoured to fulfil them to the letter, and, that being so, he was anxious not to use any terms which could give rise to misunderstandings. He thought the actual promise made by his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer of £930,000 was exceedingly generous, and he thought it was sometimes forgotten that on a balance it meant several hundred thousand a year in the pockets of the ratepayers if education was kept at its present level, inasmuch as that gift from the Exchequer was largely in excess of the amount to which voluntary subscribers would be relieved. He quite recognised, however, that probably education would not be kept at its present level, and he did not disguise from the House that probably there must be a burden put on ratepayers who did not now bear that burden. Moreover it was possible, taking the ratepayers altogether as one corporate community, that they might not be gainers, but rather losers, by the Bill in the long run. He also recognised that the ratepayers were overburdened, and he desired to repeat the hope which he expressed earlier in the evening that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might at no distant date be able to add something to the large and not ungenerous gift he had already made. He hoped that statement would satisfy his right hon. friend. It was not a pledge, and must not be taken as a pledge. It was a hope, an earnest and an honest hope, and one which he trusted the House would see fulfilled.

MR. CHAPLIN felt that his right hon. friend had said as much as a Minister in his position could say at present, and he therefore asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. M'KENNA said before the Amendment was withdrawn, he wished to know whether the rate for the margin of the expense of education would be settled by representatives of people who did not themselves pay the rate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that matter had been dealt with.

(10.13). Question put.

*The CHAIRMAN declared that the "Ayes" had it.

The decision being challenged,

*The CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. Members who challenge my decision to rise in their places.

Several Hon. Members having risen,

The Committee divided. Ayes 291; Noes, 14. (Division List No. 501.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds.
Balfour, Kenneth R. Christch.
Bell, Richard
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leng, Sir John
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Levy, Maurice
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

M'Arthur William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Maxwell, W G H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moss, Samuel
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Pirie, Duncan V.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, John Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxeth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Tomkinson, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Wallace, Robert
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, George (Norfolk)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Cremer, William Randal
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Lambert, George
Lloyd-George, David
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
White, Luke (York, E.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Edward Strachey and Mr. Soares.

*(10.30.) MR. SOARES in moving an Amendment to provide for the payment of "the reasonable travelling expenses of the members of the education committee," said the object of his proposal was to promote efficiency in education, and so far as he knew it did not conflict with the political principles of either Party. It was, in fact, a logical result of the decision of the Committee as to the advisability of members of existing School Boards being appointed on the education committees. It would greatly conduce to the power and efficiency of the education committee if the poorer portion of the middle class, and also working men, were represented upon it. The former were perpetually making great sacrifices in order to confer upon their children the great boon of a good education, and many of them were of an altruistic turn of mind, and would care for the education not only of their own children but also of others. Then it must not be forgotten that it was the children of working men who were principally affected by the Bill, and therefore as a class they ought to have a voice in the application of the principles of the Bill. None would deny that the Labour Members of Parliament were an extremely valuable addition to the House, as they knew from practical experience what other Members knew only from

hearsay or in theory. One thing was perfectly clear, viz., that the larger the field for the selection of the education committee the better the education committee would be. They had fought for that principle with regard to the question of the appointment of teachers, but had been beaten on that point on denominational grounds. But there were no such grounds to be alleged against this Amendment. Unless some such Amendment as he had proposed was accepted, they would shut the door to the poorer portion of the middle class and to working men. As a matter of fact we found that County Councils consisted mainly of the squire and other wealthy men—not because the poorer men would not be elected if they put up, but because they could not stand as the expenses entailed were so heavy. The education committees, at first, would have a considerable number of meetings, and, as the areas were very large, the travelling expenses would form a serious item. He was aware that there was no precedent for the course he was proposing, but there were several things in the Bill itself for which there was no precedent. He did not look upon the Amendment as verbally inspired, and so long as the principle was accepted he was prepared to accept any other form of words.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, after the word 'Council, to insert the words 'including the reasonable travelling expenses of the members of the education committee.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BRYCE joined earnestly in the appeal of his hon. friend that favourable consideration should be given to this Amendment. It would be difficult enough to induce many of those whom they would like to see on the Education Committee to give their time to the work, and if they removed the difficulty which the expense of travelling imposed it would be a great advantage to the new bodies. Clause 12 provided that persons with an experience of education and acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools should be added to the education committee. Among those schools were many which gave practical or technical instruction, and it was very desirable that no consideration of expense for travelling should prevent persons who had a practical knowledge of the work done by the technical schools from being able to attend the committee. This was a valuable principle, and one that could easily be distinguished from the cases of other local authorities. It was a new case altogether. A new system was being started, and they ought to give that new system the best possible chance of enlisting the assistance of a class whose knowledge and interest ought to be in the service of education.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said every one would share the general view of the right hon. Gentleman and the mover of the Amendment that every facility should be given for the attendance on these committees of as many as possible of the capable men whose services they desired to obtain. But no sound reason had been given why in this particular instance there should be a departure from the principle which had hitherto been consistently maintained in regard to all branches of local government. Generalities had been indulged in, but there had been no special evidence adduced to justify the Committee in believing that there would be any difficulties in the way of the attendance upon the education committee of representatives of the labouring class which were greater than those at present existining regard to County Councils, Boards of Guardians, or any other local governing bodies. As a matter of practice, what was it that obtained in their County Councils? There were on nearly every County Council excellent representatives of the working classes. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."]

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): No.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not know whether the hon. Member disputed his statement as to the word "excellent" or "representatives," but it was idle for the hon. Gentleman to contradict him, for he was speaking of what he knew.

MR. BROADHURST: So am I.

Mr. WALTER LONG insisted that there were excellent representatives of the working classes on many of their County Councils, and it had never yet been asserted that if working men were absent from County Councils it was because they could not afford to pay their travelling expenses. What had been said, and what was said, by the mover of the Amendment was that it was not the travelling expenses that prevented working men from attending on these bodies, but the fact that they could not spare the time necessary for the performance of these duties.

* Mr. SOARES: I said it was the travelling expenses principally which caused them to be unable to be elected on these bodies.

Mr. WALTER LONG said it was not the travelling expenses alone that prevented working men joining public bodies. Everybody must know that men whose daily employment was a matter of money, in nine cases out of ten could not afford, unless they were paid for the work, to give up their employment to attend the meetings. If they justified the payment of travelling expenses on the ground that they wanted the presence of these men on the County Councils, why should they not go further and pay them their out-of-pocket expenses? That was a proposal which had never yet been assented to by Parliament, and he hoped the Committee would not in this particular instance, and on such insufficient grounds, take a departure from anything that had yet been found necessary in any branch of their local government.

Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley) pointed out that on Urban District Councils travelling expenses were paid.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that that applied only to members who went outside the area of the Council on business connected with the Council, but it had nothing whatever to do with attendance at the meetings of the body itself within its area. The proposal would be a serious departure from a well recognised and hitherto generally accepted principle which ought not to be made except on much stronger grounds than had been put forward.

Mr. BROADHURST said if the right hon. Gentleman had confined his remarks about Labour representation to London he would have strengthened his position, for there were several most careful and powerful representatives of labour on the London County Council. If, however, the right hon. Gentleman meant that there was a good representation of labour by working men on County Councils generally, then he was entirely wrong, and it was on that point that he ventured to contradict the right hon. Gentleman. The difficulty was that many agricultural labourers and village tradesmen would not be able to give their services if their expenses were not allowed, although they would not mind losing a day's work occasionally. The expenses of an agricultural labourer attending meetings of this kind for one day would probably be six times as much as his loss in wages. Although it was quite true that County Councils were elected by popular vote, the expenses attaching to service on County Councils really constituted a property qualification, and although technically there was no such qualification, in practice a considerable qualification was necessary. He had served many years on a County Council, and to attend its meetings involved on an average a cost of 10s. per day. That was more than any working man could afford. He should like to do service on many of the committees of the County Council but he had been obliged to resign his membership of those committees on account of the heavy cost attaching to attendance at those meetings. There was no reason why they should not allow expenses in these particular cases. He thought the right hon. Gentleman opposite would remember that in the year 1888 this question was fought in several divisions, and what did they say at that time? Their argument was that in the overwhelming majority of County Councils, labour would be excluded by direct representation by Labour representatives unless reasonable travelling expenses were allowed. That had proved to be true. He did not suppose that they could find twenty real working men, representative of labour, on the County Councils in the whole of the kingdom outside London. Therefore his hon. friend's Amendment was only a reproduction of a Motion which they made upon a former occasion with regard to reasonable travelling expenses being allowed. The hon. Member for the Shipley Division of Yorkshire was perfectly right in what he had said. It was an acknowledged fact that they prevented the direct representation of labour by refusing to pay their travelling expenses; and yet the members of the Council, by being appointed on deputations and instructed to undertake all sorts of investigations, experiments, and conferences, could have their expenses paid upon the most liberal, and sometimes the most lavish, scale. Therefore he thought the interjection of the hon. Member opposite was most valuable, and he did not think the President of the Local Government Board appreciated the course of that remark. If his hon. friend behind him would modify his Amendment in order to insert the words "where applied for"—[OPPOSITION cries of "No, no!"]—he was only endeavouring to do something which would ease the rash position which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had taken up. [AN HON. MEMBER: That would be invidious.] Yes, it would, but there were some Members of this House who got pensions, and others who did not get them. There was no indignity in connection with that procedure in the House; at any rate, if he had the opportunity he should not consider it beneath his dignity. He was only now taking a Conservative view of the matter. He was sure his hon. friend would not mind modifying his Amendment in this respect, if by that means they could induce the Government to meet them in regard to this matter. What they prophesied upon this subject in 1888 had come true, for labour had been excluded from direct representation by working men on account of the insurmountable expense, not so much in regard to the loss of wage earning, as in regard to the out-of pocket expenses in regard to travelling and other matters. Now the Government had the opportunity of rectifying the mistake they made in 1888. In that year the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that no difficulty would arise, and that Labour representatives would find their way on to those Councils, but it had been proved that this was not true, and this object could not be accomplished unless an Amendment, similar to the one now before the Committee was inserted in the Bill.

*(10.55.) MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said he thought this was a subject upon which a Member representing Labour interests could fairly claim the indulgence of the Committee for a few moments. The right hon. Gentleman representing the Government on this question said there was no precedent for such a proposal. The adoption of this proposal would not be the first precedent set in this House, and he was sure that it would be one of the best precedents that Parliament had ever set. It had been said that these expenses did not debar working-men from joining public bodies. He thought he could show that the opposite was the case. He could prove that, in Lancashire, working-men were taking a great interest in public affairs. In the borough of Colne, one-third the members of the Council were Labour representatives, simply on account of the fact that there were no out-of-pocket expenses attached to their attendance at the meetings of that Council. In Nelson, there were three or four Labour members on the Council, and in Blackburn there were no less than eight Labour representatives. Those were all places where there were no out-of-pocket expenses entailed in regard to attendance. Those three instances would prove that working-men were anxious to attend on these public bodies in order to give what little intelligence and service they could when they had the opportunity. Probably hon. Members would say that this was not a very expensive business. Let them put the expense at 5s. per week. The trade with which he had been closely connected was one in which the average weekly wage was not more than 23s. or 24s. a week. He would ask hon. Members whose incomes were perhaps something like £50 a week whether they would like to sacrifice one-fourth of that income in order to attend the meetings of any public body? This 5s. a week to the class of men he had referred to would be a far more serious loss to them than the loss of £25 or £30 per week to some hon. Members of this House. The argument put forward in reference to the payment of these

expenses proved their case. If it was right to pay men when they left their homes as members of deputations and other such work, by the instruction of public bodies, surely it was right for any other kind of work in connection with those public bodies to pay out-of-pocket expenses with regard to attendance at those meetings. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, representing the Government, stated that there were a large number of working men on these County Councils, but he was very much mistaken. Take for example the County of Lancaster, which had over 100 members, not one of them being a working man. And why? If a member had to attend the meetings of that Council from Darwen it would mean 3s. or 3s. 6d. railway fare. No working man earning the wages he had mentioned could afford to lose that amount of money out of his wages. He thought the Amendment of his hon. friend was a very moderate one, and this proposal gave the Government an opportunity which they ought to take immediate advantage of. If his hon. friend had asked that not only the travelling expenses but also a certain payment should be made he should have agreed with him. Surely when they were simply asking for out-of-pocket expenses that was a fair and a just demand, and no hon. Member ought to vote against it. He should support the Amendment which had been moved by his hon. friend.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud,) said the issues upon this Amendment seemed to be very clear on both sides of the House. On the Opposition side they wished to make it easier for working men to obtain representation on public bodies, while on the other side of the House hon. Members simply relied upon precedent. These education committees would have immense power in the counties for good or evil. Personally, he believed they would be the real education authority. Nominally, he was aware, they were only an advisory committee, but the work which the County Councils were already doing was so great that these education committees would become really the administrative bodies. That being so, they ought to make it easy for working men to serve, for after all it was mostly their children who would be educated in those schools. Not only ought they to allow these out-of-pocket expenses, but they ought to do everything they could to encourage Labour representatives to take part in this educational work. The point referred to upon the Second Reading by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen came up again in this discussion, namely, that if they had the enthusiasm of the people behind it a bad system of education was better than a good system with indifference behind it. It seemed to him that they ought to try by every means in their power to encourage the enthusiasm and interests of the working classes in education, and they would be accomplishing this if they made it possible for more Labour representatives to serve on the education committees. He did not quite understand what the right hon. Gentleman meant, when he said that there was no precedent for this Amendment. Perhaps there was not an exact precedent, but an intimate friend of his, who was a member of the London County Council, assured him that when he visited places on behalf of the Council he was allowed expenses and first-class fare.

MR. WALTER LONG: That is exactly what I said. I stated that where members of the Council went outside their area they got their expenses.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN said the Government insisted upon sticking to the old precedent, and would not make a new one, although the distance to be travelled for the purpose of attending meetings was very often much greater than the distance to be travelled in reference to deputations and other matters. In Gloucestershire, for example, it took a councillor practically all day to attend the meetings from some of the outlying districts; therefore the attitude taken up by the right hon. Gentleman was a very fine point indeed, and he felt that justice, and right, and good policy were on their side.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Crickdale), said he wished to say a few words from a County Council point of view. He confessed that he was a little astonished when he heard the President of the Local Government Board say, as he did at first, without any qualification, that there were a considerable number of working men upon different County Councils of England. He did not think that was so. He admitted that here and there a working man had found his way on to a County Council, but on the whole this was an exceptional thing. In many of the English counties it seemed to him to stand to reason, considering the whole of the circumstances of the case, that it was almost impossible for working men, unless under favoured circumstances, to find their way on to the County Council. With regard to the Amendment, they had been told that it would establish an exceedingly dangerous precedent, and would open the door to an enormous extension of this principle. He could not help thinking that really this was an exaggeration. Why should they draw a distinction between the cases of those who were working, so to speak, at the very doors of the place of meeting, and those who lived close by? A suggestion had been made that the rule should not have general application, but that the onus should be thrown upon the individual to ask for payment. When the question of the payment of Members of Parliament came up Mr. Gladstone pointed out that he would be in favour of drawing some distinction of that kind, but great as was his authority the feeling was at that time that it would be a very dangerous thing to draw such a distinction, and the idea that was present in Mr. Gladstone's mind was fear of the expense which would be involved. Naturally it was felt at that time that it was not a desirable thing to increase public expenditure. He wished to ask whether there was any real danger of a great expense being incurred in this matter. He did not think the Amendment would entail any great expense. The County Councils met on an average only four times a year, though no doubt there would be more frequent meetings of the education authority. If they took the average number of meetings of the County Council and what would likely be the number of meetings of the education committees and totalled them up, he was disposed to think that there would be no such enormous expenditure in this respect as had been indicated by the right hon. Gentleman. He would be willing to accept as a compromise the suggestion of his hon. friend behind him, though it was open to the objection he had tried to state. He did not believe that a claim openly and honourably made by a man who desired to have his expenses paid would affect his standing as a member of the committee. The President of the Local Government Board had said that the difficulty was that a Labour member who was in somebody else's employment could not afford the time or would not be allowed by his employer to attend the meetings. But it should be borne in mind that there were a great many Labour representatives who were not in that position—men who, though originally working men, had retired from the ranks of manual labourers, but had not ceased to be regarded by their fellows as Labour representatives. He was inclined to think that those were precisely the men who were likely to be represented on the committee. It should be possible for those men to have their expenses paid and that they should not be placed under the great disadvantages they would undoubtedly suffer if they were obliged to travel, at their own expense, from the extreme end of the county to the county town in order to attend the meetings of the committee.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said he hoped the Committee would not sanction the suggestion which had been made, that working men on the local authority might have their expenses paid if they claimed them. He would never like to be put in such an invidious position. Whenever an election took place the opponent of a candidate brought forward in the Labour interest would point out to the constituency that if he were elected he would do the work gratuitously. He had the honour to be one of the deputation that waited on Mr. Gladstone on the subject of the payment of Members. When the suggestion was made that an arrangement might be come to whereby Members might be paid if they were prepared to make a declaration that they required payment, he was glad to say that all the Labour representatives repudiated the suggestion at once, and said that, so far as they were personally concerned, they would never tolerate being put in such an invidious position. The Amendment now before the Committee was one that deserved support. Labouring men who were members of Borough Councils at present had no out-of-pocket travelling expenses because they lived in the immediate vicinity of the places where the meetings were held. The case was vastly different so far as County Councils were concerned, because the men were often compelled to travel scores of miles to the place of meeting, paying their travelling expenses and losing a day's pay, except, as in the counties of Durham and Northumberland, where the Labour representatives had powerful trade unions behind them to pay the expenses, and also, in many cases, the wages which would otherwise be lost. Was it fair that the labouring classes of the country should have imposed on them financial disabilities when they desired to represent their fellow-workmen on the local institutions of the country? He believed that no hon. Member wished to exclude representative workingmen from serving on public bodies, but by the present system they had practically imposed upon them a financial test or financial disability. It was impossible for working men in all cases to bear the loss of travelling expenses and wages if they wished to represent their fellow-workers on local authorities, and he hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment which proposed that reasonable travelling expenses should be allowed. The children of the working classes were being educated in the schools. Working men were, therefore, directly interested in the management of the schools, and it seemed to him that they were fit and proper persons to be elected members of the education committee, but that in his judgment was impossible unless the Committee adopted the Amendment.

MR JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said he was proud to be a member of Durham County Council, which last week did him the honour of electing him vice-chairman. He did not put forward a claim specially on behalf of the representation of labour on local administrative bodies, but his contention was that these bodies were not so complete as they ought to be unless labour was represented. There were twenty-two or twenty-four working-men members of the Durham County Council, and four or five of them were Aldermen. The question he wished to ask was whether the Durham County Council, or any other local body, was or was not more effective for good by having working men upon it. He held that they were the better for having working men, and if that point was granted it was the duty of Parliament to facilitate their entrance to these bodies. But for the fact that he lived almost at the doorstep of the Durham County Council, he was not rich enough—and he was not ashamed to say so—to throw money away in that direction. He was willing to give his labour, knowedge and experience to the people, but he did not think he was in a position to take upon himself the burden of paying expenses such as must fall upon men who lived at a distance from the place of meeting. In view of the fact which had been pointed out by the hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division that it was largely, if not entirely, the children of working men who would have to be educated in the elementary schools, he thought the education committee should include men of that class. They should be allowed reasonable expenses to refund what they were out of pocket. He knew that the working men of the country, however poor they might be, had more regard for the principle involved in this proposal than they had for getting money into their pockets. If the House were to grant this demand to working men only, the working men would feel themselves insulted. Either all must have the concession, or none.

*MR. BUTCHER (York) said he had considerable sympathy with the object of the Amendment, which appeared to him to indicate a legitimate means of facilitating the presence of representatives of the working classes on the education committees. But he very much doubted whether this was a suitable time for introducing a new principle into our system of local government, as they would be undoubtedly doing if they were to accept this Amendment. The truth was that the question now before the Committee appeared to be only part of the very much larger question as to whether it would not be right that reasonable travelling expenses, and possibly other expenses, of County Councillors and members of other local bodies should be paid for them. That was a matter which might be fairly open to argument, and he should like to see it raised in debate in this House. But he could not sufficiently differentiate the position of the new education committees from that of other local bodies as to make it possible for him to say that they ought to pay the expenses of the one and not of the other.

(11.35.) SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said he was glad, and not sorry, to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman say that he felt considerable sympathy with the arguments that had been urged in favour of this Amendment. The hon. Member said this was not the proper place or the proper time to introduce this great change. He hardly ever knew a time or place when it suited the Government of the day to introduce a proposed change of this kind. He differed entirely from the hon. Member for York, because if ever this proposal for enabling working men, and men of very limited means, to take part in the discharge of public duties—and all men had some sort of claim as citizens not to be out of pocket on account of discharging public duties—the best of all places to begin with were these education committees. It was the opportunity of admitting to those bodies the very men who of all others were interested in the work. If they had a number of co-opted superior persons on these committees, learned in their own accomplishments, they might be very useful, but not one of them would have a child in the schools controlled by the committee. The men for whom his hon. friends had spoken were those whose children's future would depend on the excellence of the education given in the public elementary schools. He should have thought that this was an occasion, of all others, to introduce a change when nobody could say a word against it on its merits.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he would like to make a suggestion. He thought they were all agreed on having on these education committees men such as had been described by the right hon. Gentleman. It was quite certain, however, that some of these men would not be able to attend the committee meetings unless they had a reasonable allowance for expenses. He was one of the few persons in the House who really trusted the local education authorities, and he would give them power to pay such part of the travelling expenses of the members of the education committee as they thought desirable.

MR. BELL (Derby) said he desired to contribute a few observations to this interesting debate, and he did so practically on the ground that the Prime Minister had stated the previous night that the number of those on the Opposition side of the House who had spoken against the Bill were very few. So far as this question was concerned he had been a silent Member; he had been content to look on and listen without reiterating what had been already said. So far as the Labour section of the Opposition was concerned he believed they heartily supported the Amendment. He could not altogether agree with the suggestion of the right hon. Member for Cambridge University, inasmuch as he would be the last man to allow any local authority to pay expenses in what was called "deserving cases." He should feel thathe would not be a man to be pauperised.

SIR JOHN GORST said he did not mean that the committee should decide whether the members were to be paid or not their expenses, but that the committee was to decide what kind of expenses were to be paid.

MR. BELL said if that were made general he could see no objection to it, but it should be inserted in the Bill. He thought that hon. Gentlemen in the House would agree, notwithstanding the abuse to which labour representatives on local bodies had been subjected in *The Times* lately, that it was desirable that working men should be represented on these local bodies by their fellow-workmen. He knew of a signalman on one of the trunk railways who had the honour of being elected as chairman of a School Board, and of his District Council; and there were many men of intelligence among the working classes fitted for these positions. The intelligence of working men was not to be measured by their grammar. They were the people who felt the disadvantage of not having had the best of education in their school days. In many local bodies working men were ably represented by their fellows, and he wished to see the system extended. After all, the working men had to fight their way to these offices on their merits, and he hoped the House and the Prime Minister would give them an opportunity of being chosen to the education committee by paying their reasonable travelling expenses when discharging public duties.

MR. JOHNSTONE said he wished to support the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University. Frankly speaking, he thought that labour had bulked much too largely in this Amendment. He was not a blind worshipper of labour, but he recognised that there were men of intelligence, but of small means, who would have to do a great deal of the general drudgery of the work in connection with this Education Bill; and he believed that the cause of education would be served if the education committees had the power to pay their reasonable expenses. The right sort of men would always be welcomed in these education committees, and it had been shown, in the course of the debate, that Labour members had no difficulty in securing places on the County Councils. He thought there should be no difficulty in having their expenses paid, as the labourer is worthy of his hire; but he was unable to support the Amendment in its present form.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he was rather expecting the Government to declare what they were going to do with the suggestion of the right hon. the Member for Cambridge University. There appeared to be only one opinion in the House as to the absolute desirability of having Labour representatives and men of limited means on these education committees. The right hon. Gentleman who voiced the opinion of the Government did not deny that, but he made the stock reply that this was not a good or convenient opportunity to make the change. What he wanted to point out was that if this Amendment were not accepted a disqualification would be placed upon poor men from which they had not suffered under the School Board system. Hitherto there had been no difficulty in having poor men on the School Boards. In his own parish it was considered so desirable to have men of limited means on the School Boards, that the meetings were held in the evening so as to meet the convenience of these members. It would be a hardship on persons of limited means who had to travel some distance to attend the Education committee meetings if they had to pay their own personal expenses. They had poor Members of Parliament who were an honour, and added dignity and power to the House. The hon. Member for Mid Durham, with his characteristic independence, had told the House that he would not be able to attend the House without some pecuniary recompense. Could anybody say that men of the character and experience of his hon. friend should not be represented on the education committees? After the speech of his hon. friend, especially when it was conceded that by the Clause as it stood they were placing a disqualification on men of his standing, nothing more need be said in favour of the Amendment. He hoped the Government would be in a hurry to reply. It would be no dishonour for the Government to say that a mistake had been made in this matter. It would be said that they were not weak, but strong, in admitting that they had been convinced that the position that they had adopted was one that could no longer be maintained, and that now was the time and opportunity for rendering this measure of justice to poor men.

MR. LYTTELTON (Warwick and Leamington) said he thought the Opposition had had the best of the argument on this matter. For his part he desired to move an Amendment to the Amendment, in support of the position taken up by his right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University. He thought the general principle, of which he was certainly a most cordial supporter, that members of public bodies should not, as a rule, be paid, need not be infringed by the principle laid down by his right hon. friend. On the two grounds that the working classes were primarily interested in this matter, as it would be their children who attended the schools, and that it had been made compulsory that certain women should be members of these committees — both of which grounds made a clear distinction between this and ordinary cases—he moved to insert in the Amendment after the word "including" the words "such reasonable travelling expenses for members of the education committee as the local authority may think fit."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the first word 'the,' and insert the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Question proposed, "That the first word 'the' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (No. 2) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 1:—

Motion made and Question proposed—"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that hon. Members were surely not to be called upon to discuss a Bill of this importance after twelve o'clock. He would not, in the ordinary course, have objected to that procedure, because the Bill had been practically accepted by the House; but on the last two or three occasions on which the Bill was before the House several Members were anxious to hear details as to how the money was to be expended, but the Colonial Secretary was not in his place, and they had been waiting apparently in the unfounded hope that the right hon. Gentleman would be present to make explanations. He knew that the Government could insist on their technical right to take a Financial Bill after midnight, but surely a Bill which raised important questions of policy and administration should not be taken at that late hour. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would not postpone the Bill so as to allow the Colonial Secretary to be present to discharge the duty for which he was paid by the House. He begged to move that the Chairman report progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed—

"That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon)), said he was astonished at the attitude taken by the Hon. Member, who must know that the essence of this Bill was that it should be passed quickly.

MR. DALZIEL: Why does not the Minister concerned come and help you to pass it?

*MR. RITCHIE said that if his right hon. friend were present no question of policy in connection with South Africa could be raised at this stage of the Bill. It was most essential that this money should be voted by the House, and placed at the disposal of Lord Milner, and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not press his Motion.

MR. DALZIEL said that the right hon. Gentleman must be aware that the hon. Member for Dundee intended to raise several questions in regard to the Bill, but postponed them till the Committee stage.

(12.8.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 23; Noes, 115. (Division List No. 502.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Warner.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helme, Norval Watson
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horniman, Frederick John
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R).
Kennedy, Patrick James
Keswick, William
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Purvis, Robert
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Col. Robert
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.

Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Question again proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. DALZIEL said he did not intend to oppose the Bill, owing to the circumstances of the case; but he thought that the Government were not serving their own object or the interests of the House in asking hon. Members to sit and discuss matters of this important kind after twelve o'clock. They were in no way opposed to the principle of the Bill, which was the first in regard to South African affairs on which for many years there was a unanimous opinion. He asked the Government whether, if they got to the Committee stage tonight, they would postpone the Third Reading, so that hon. Members could get the information they desired.

*MR. RITCHIE said he should ask the House to take the Third Reading as soon as he possibly could. As he had already stated, it was essential that this Bill should pass quickly in order to place Lord Milner in funds.

MR. DALZIEL asked if the right hon. Gentleman would take the Third Reading tomorrow. If so, he would not further press his motion.

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes.

MR. DALZIEL: That is all I wanted.

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time Tomorrow.

BANKERS (IRELAND) ACT REPEAL BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Motion made, and Question proposed "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) moved that Progress be reported.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) asked the hon. Member not to press his Motion. This was a most useful Bill, and only repealed an old Irish Act of George II.

MR. CALDWELL said that that might be so, but it took away the security which the people of Ireland had under that old Act. He insisted upon Progress being reported.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 13th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (STANDING ORDERS).

Petition from Royal and other burghs of Scotland, for a new Standing Order providing for the Suspension of Bills; to lie upon the Table.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Chesterfield; Clay Cross; Pleasley; and Cefn; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Bridgwater (three); Glasgow; and Skipton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Clay Cross; Pleasley; Cefn; and Chesterfield; to lie upon the Table.

FEES FOR BURIAL SERVICES IN PAROCHIAL CEMETERIES.

Petition from Shoreditch, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Chesterfield, Clay Cross; Pleasley; and Cefn; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1902.

Copy presented, of Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the Colonies and other possessions of the United Kingdom for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 14, 1902).

Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting import duties in Zanzibar. Signed at Washington, 31st May, 1902. Ratifications exchanged, 17th October, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Schoolmasters' Houses.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the total amount of grants made since 1843 for schoolmasters' houses; and whether he will consider the expediency of providing, at some future stage of the Education Bill, for the recognition of the claim of the public to the use of such houses jointly with their use by the trustees of the school.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I cannot give the figures asked for by the hon. Member; but I am having them prepared with all speed. The second part of the Question is under consideration.

Port Ellen—Delay of Mails.

MR. NICOL (Argyll): To ask the Postmaster General how often during the past year has the mail steamer "Glencoe" delivered the mails at 4 p.m. at Port Ellen, Islay, and how often have the road mails from Portaskaig been delivered at Port Ellen at 7·55, the schedule times; whether the steamer or the road mail is the cause of the detention, and have any or either incurred any penalty; and, if so, has such penalty been imposed.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The schedule time of arrival of the mails at Port Ellen is 4·25 p.m. when conveyed to that port by direct steamer (and not 4 p.m. as stated in the Question). When conveyed by steamer to Portaskaig and thence by road to Port Ellen the mails are due at 8·25 p.m. (and not 7·55 p.m. as stated in the Question). From the 1st of January to the 31st of October last the direct steamer arrived at Port Ellen on seventy-two occasions at or before the scheduled time, and on 101 occasions after that hour; but the average lateness for the 173 days has not amounted to a quarter of an hour. During the last four months, comprising the season in which the mails and traffic are heavier than at any other time of the year, the

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

mails sent via Portaskaig have reached Port Ellen at or before the scheduled time on four occasions. On the other thirty occasions there has been some delay, owing in great part to irregularity in the working of the train service to Gourock; and the delays in the steamer service have not been sufficient to call for the imposition of a penalty. The road service between Portaskaig and Port Ellen has been well performed, but it has lately been necessary to allow additional time for the journey on account of the detour which has to be made through the closing of a bridge, which had been damaged by floods.

London Telegraph Operators—Qualifications.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Postmaster General whether, seeing that in 1880 a scale of pay was introduced in London giving to telegraph operators the salary of £190 per year, and that the late Controller, Sir H. Fischer, stated that seniority, good conduct, and manipulative ability secured this salary to operating telegraphists, he will state what qualifications are necessary to secure this salary at the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The qualifications are ability, good conduct, length of service, and fitness for the work of supervision; and the Postmaster General selects for promotion from among the candidates so qualified the officer who is in his opinion, all things considered, best fitted for the duties which have to be performed.

Pacific Cable—Rates.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster General, whether the rate per word for cable messages between England and Australasia *viâ* the Pacific has yet been fixed; and, if so, whether he has any objection to giving the information.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am informed by the Pacific Cable Board that they have fixed the rate per word between England and Australasia at 3s.

Board of Education Inspectors—Mr. H. M. Richards.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education with reference to the appointment of Mr. Barnett, one of the inspectors of the Board, in Natal, whether he will state the name of his successor and state what experience he has had in educational work, and in particular whether he has had any experience in public elementary schools before being sent to inspect them.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Mr. Henry Maunsell Richards, M.A., has been appointed a temporary Inspector in place of Mr. Barnett. Mr. Richards holds the elementary school teachers' certificate of the Board of Education, and taught in elementary schools from 1895–7. He was subsequently for four years head master of the Middlesex County High School, Isleworth, and became a junior inspector under the Board of Education in September, 1901.

Education Bill—Definition of "School" in Clause 15 (a).

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the word "school," in Clause 15 (*a*) of the Education Bill, includes a public elementary school.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Yes, Sir.

Education Bill—Credit Balances in Hands of Voluntary School Managers.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will say whether, in the event of the Education Bill now before Parliament becoming law, the managers of voluntary schools will be allowed to appropriate for their own purposes, that is, to the upkeep of the school buildings, etc., any credit balances they may have in hand at the time of the adoption of the Act.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Understanding by "their own purposes" the purposes for which the managers have to make provision in the Bill, the answer is in the affirmative.

Education Bill—Members of Education Committee interested in Contracts.

MR. MANSFIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will state, in the event of the Education Bill now before Parliament becoming law, what will be the position of a member of the Council of a county borough, or other authority charged with the administration of the Act, who, previous to the passing of the Act, had undertaken contracts with the School Board within the same area, and which contracts are not completed at the time of the passing of the Act, and will such a contractor invalidate his seat on the Council.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Persons "concerned in any bargain or contract" with a District Council are (subject to certain exceptions) disqualified from being members of the Council by Section 46 (*e*) of The Local Government Act, 1894. Persons having "directly or indirectly . . . any share or interest in any contract" with a County or Borough Council, are (subject to certain exceptions) disqualified from membership of the Council by Section 12 (1) (*c*) of The Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and Sections 2 and 75 of The Local Government Act, 1888. Contracts entered into with School Boards will be taken over by the new authorities, and will carry with them the disqualification for membership of those authorities.

Navy (Ships' Boilers) Return—Alterations since Commissioning.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the Return, Navy (Ships' Boilers); No. 356, dated 17th October, 1902, does not include the cost of any alterations or additions made since commissioning, he will state the expenses incurred for alterations or additions with regard to the ships mentioned in the Return.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) There is no objection to giving the additional information now asked for, but as a large number of ships are involved it would probably be more convenient to give it in the form of a Return, if the noble Lord will move for one.

Factory and Workshops Act, 1901—Local Inquiries.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that objections are entertained by operatives in the industry of file-cutting by hand, as well as by the Cutlers' Company, to some of the proposed new regulations under Section 79 of the Factory and Workshops Act of 1901; and whether he will take care that the new rules are not put into force until a local inquiry has been held into the objections taken to them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) When I issued these regulations in draft I invited criticisms on the proposals contained in them, and I have received objections to some of them both from operatives in Sheffield and from the Cutlers' Company. A local inquiry will be held, at which all persons affected by the proposed regulations will be heard, before they are finally settled and put into force.

Committee on Consular Service.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the names of the members of the Committee now inquiring into the Consular Service, and why the distribution of the Service is not included in the terms of reference.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) I have already stated to the House that the inquiry is a Departmental inquiry, and that, according to the practice in such cases, it would certainly be impossible to promise the publication of the Report until the Secretary of State shall have had an opportunity of considering it. The question of giving the terms of the reference upon which the Report will be founded seems naturally to depend upon what is ultimately decided in regard to the publication of the Report. The last Question I answered on the 10th instant.†

Delays in the Dublin Courts.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the delays in cases pending trial in the Dublin Four Courts, especially in the Court of the Lord Chief Justice; and if he will take steps to prevent a continuance of this delay.

---

† See page 453.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) My attention has not been called to any cases of delays in pending trials. As far as I have been able to ascertain no such delays exist. It is open to any person who alleges he has been delayed to apply to the Court to expedite the hearing of his case. As far as I have been able to ascertain no such applications have been made. I have no power to interfere as suggested, and if I had the power the occasion does not appear to have arisen for the exercise of it.

Discharging Firearms on the Public Road.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the evening of 18th October, while the Tullyvallen National Flute Band were playing along the road near Silverbridge, County Armagh, one Robert Coulter came out of his house and fired four shots from a revolver at them while two constables from Cullyhanna were then present; and whether he will take steps to prosecute this man.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) A prosecution has been ordered in this case.

Officers' Barracks Furniture.

MR. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers who have joined the Army during the War, and have served in South Africa up to the present time and are now returning home, can be provided with furnished quarters on the same terms as those joining the Army on or after 1st December, 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The officers referred to will be granted furniture on the same terms as those joining on or after 1st December.

South Africa—Treatment of Prisoners of War (British Subjects).

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War what steps do the Government mean to take with regard to prisoners of war who were British subjects some time previous to the declaration of war in South Africa; whether some of the above, who are clerks in the commandants' offices, are to be allowed to go back to South Africa; are exceptions to be made, or will all such prisoners of war be permitted to return; do the Government intend to recognise as burghers all prisoners of war whose papers were signed before the declaration of war; and when do the Government propose releasing all prisoners of war, or taking steps to secure their discharge from custody.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) Prisoners of war who were British subjects previous to the outbreak of the war are not in the position of burghers of the late Republics, and are therefore not entitled to be sent back to South Africa under the terms of surrender. His Majesty's Government cannot recognise any naturalisation on or after 29th September, 1899, on which date the Volksraad of the South African Republic passed a resolution referring to the war which, it was stated, threatened to break out between the Republic and Great Britain, and promising burghership to all who assisted the Republic. It is hoped that the return of all prisoners of war who came within the terms of surrender will be complete early next year.

1st and 2nd Army Corps—Number of Effective Men.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War can he state the number of effective non-commissioned officers and men of over three months service in the 1st and 2nd Army Corps respectively, giving the numbers of regulars, militia, and efficient volunteers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The detailed figures required can only be obtained by calling for Returns from each unit concerned. Every effort is now being made to cut down Returns, and the hon. Member will doubtless agree as to the undesirability of calling for the figures.

Volunteer Regulations—Exemptions from Camp Attendance.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, considering the fact that a number of old volunteers, many of them the best shots in their battalions, cannot comply with the new regulations respecting attendance at camp, he will consider the advisability of making some concession to men who have served for a period, say, of ten or fifteen years, allowing attendance at camp in their case to be optional.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) If the hon. Member will kindly refer to Army Order 119 of 1902 he will find that the regulations therein set forth apply to these cases. The selection of the officers and volunteers to be exempted from attendance at camp rests with the commanding officer. It is not held practicable to make length of service, apart from other conditions, a definite qualification for exemption in the manner suggested by the hon. Member.

Mountain and Garrison Artillery.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Mountain Artillery is a senior service to the Garrison Artillery, though a branch of it, and if officers are recommended for promotion to the former from the Royal Garrison Artillery; whether, seeing that officers of Horse Artillery receive higher rates of pay than those of Field Artillery, he will say why officers of the Mountain Artillery, though they have the care of mules and horses as well as of guns, and their cost of living is higher, receive lower pay than the officers of Garrison Artillery.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Mountain Division of the Royal Garrison Artillery is not viewed as senior to the rest, but officers are, in each rank, selected from garrison companies for appointment to the mountain batteries. As regards the pay, the officers of the Mountain Artillery have no armament under their charge, and therefore are not qualified for the special pay peculiar to the garrison companies.

Newfoundland — Preferential Tariff for Empire Products.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information to the effect that the Government of the British Colony of Newfoundland is proposing to enter into a treaty with the United States of America, by which the Colony binds itself not to accord any preferential trading facilities to goods from the Mother Country or other portions of the British Empire; and, if so, whether the Imperial Government will withhold its consent from such a provision.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The Convention which has been signed does not contain any general stipulation of the nature set forth in the question. Article IV. gives a list of articles which, while the Convention is in force, are to be admitted into Newfoundland free of duty, and a further list of articles upon which the rate of duty is not to exceed a specified amount, while Article V. provides that "if any reduction is made by the Colony of Newfoundland at any time during the term of the Convention, in the rate of duty upon the articles named in Article IV. of this Convention, the said reduction of duty shall apply to the United States." The articles specified are flour, pork, bacon, hams and tongues, smoked beef and sausages, beef, pigs' heads, hocks and feet (salted and cured), Indian meal, peas, oatmeal, rice, kerosine oil.

Working of the Local Government Act in County Monaghan.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been made to him respecting the working of the Local Government Act in County Monaghan; and whether he will institute inquiry into the circumstances with a view to the re-arrangement of the electoral divisions.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Any representations made to the Local Government Board on the subject will be dealt with in the manner provided by Article 25 of the Schedule to The Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order 1898.

Spread of Consumption in Ireland.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the increasing prevalence of consumption in Ireland; and if he will direct the Local Government Board to point out to the local authorities the importance of providing in each county a properly equipped sanatorium for the treatment of such cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. The matter has engaged the most careful consideration of the Local Government Board, who have repeatedly directed the attention of sanitary authorities to the best means of preventing the further spread of this disease. In their Circular Letter of 16th September, 1901, the Board strongly urged upon boards of guardians the advisability of either making special arrangements with the managers of existing sanatoria for consumptives, or themselves erecting such sanatoria for the curative treatment of this disease. The Board have recently called upon their medical inspectors to furnish Reports as to the action taken in each district.

Emyvale Dispensary (County Monaghan) —Salary of Medical Officer.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state why the Local Government Board for Ireland reduced the salary of the medical officer of the Emyvale (County Monaghan) Dispensary below the sum arranged by the local authority.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Board of Guardians proposed to fix the salary at £160 a year. Having regard, however, to the salaries paid to medical officers of other dispensary districts in the union, and to the general circumstances of the several districts, the Local Government Board considered that the salary should be fixed at £145.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Navy—New Zealand Coal for the China Squadron.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the New Zealand coal being supplied for the use of the China Squadron is similar to that given in the Table of Analysis on page 351 of the New Zealand Official Year Book for 1901, as produced at Coalbrookdale or to that produced at Westport.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The coal supplied to the China Squadron is that produced at Granity Creek, about twenty miles from Westport. Coalbrookdale coal is produced at the Dormiston mines, also near Westport. A cargo of the latter coal is about to be tried on the China Station.

Russia and Afghanistan.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information to the effect that on 5th September the Amir of Afghanistan read in Durbar a direct communication from the Russian Government, or to the effect that the Governor of Afghan-Turkestan has received from the Governor of the adjoining part of Russian-Turkestan a message as to direct commercial relations across the Amu-Daria.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have no information as to these alleged communications.

Judicial Administration in Bengal Presidency.

MR. BARLOW (Somersetshire, Frome): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the number of cases awaiting hearing on the original and appellate sides of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in the Presidency of Bengal, and to the fact that the administration of criminal appeals is such that persons on short terms of imprisonment who have not been released on bail will probably serve their term before their appeals are heard, he can make arrangements to expedite the administration of justice in that Presidency.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: In April last I sanctioned the strengthening of the original side of the High Court at Calcutta by the appointment of an additional Judge with the necessary establishment in order to cope with the arrears of business on that side, and at the same time made suggestions for distributing the business of the Court so as to expedite its disposal on the appellate side. I am not aware that there is any such complaint as is indicated in the Question as to criminal appeals, to which precedence is always given over other business, but I will make enquiries. I may remind the hon. Member that for the last two and a half months the Court has been closed for the vacation.

China Mails.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that letters from China now arrive by the overland route in this country in twenty-six days, as against forty-four days by the mail steamships; and whether he will take this fact into consideration when revising the mail contracts.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I believe it to be the fact that letters can be sent from Chifu to London in twenty-six days. The possibilities of the Trans-Siberian route will not be overlooked in settling the mail service of the future.

P. and O. and Orient Mail Contracts.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will state when the P. and O. and Orient mail steamship contracts for the conveyance of mails to India, China, and Australia will terminate; when will new tenders be invited; and what steps are being taken to meet the difficulties now presenting themselves in regard to the employment of coloured labour on the mail steamships to Australia.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN; These contracts are terminable on or after 31st January, 1905, by two years previous notice. I cannot at present fix a date for calling for new tenders. Any questions that arise in regard to them will have to be discussed by the different Governments concerned.

Re-direction of Telegrams.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether in view of the fact that halfpenny circulars are re-directed free of charge by post while telegraphic messages cannot be so re-directed, he will give directions for the re-direction of telegrams free of charge by post.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: My hon. friend is probably aware that his suggestion has been considered by previous Postmasters General, who have not seen their way to adopt it. I will, however, look into the matter again.

Age Retirements in the Telegraph Service.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in the interests of the public and the staff, he will consider the advisability of enforcing the retirement of telegraph officials at the age of sixty years; and whether he will grant a Return showing the number of men retained after that age in the Telegraph Department, with the reasons that made an extension of time necessary.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not consider it advisable to alter the present practice regarding the retirement of telegraph (or other) officials at the age of sixty years. The rule at present is that all pensionable officers, of whatever grade, whose conduct, capacity and efficiency fall below a fair standard, shall be called upon to retire at sixty; but retirement at sixty is not enforced in the case of officers whose conduct is good and who are certified by their superior officers as thoroughly efficient. On this explanation perhaps the hon. Member will consider a Return such as he asks for unnecessary.

Welsh and Irish-speaking Postal Officials

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he can state how many officials from English and Scotch post offices have been appointed as post office officials in Welsh-speaking districts in Wales since 1st January last; and how many English and Scotch officials have been appointed to Irish post offices during the same period.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Seventeen officers from English and Scotch post offices have been appointed to offices in Welsh-speaking districts in Wales since the 1st of January last and seventeen officers from English and Scotch post offices have, during the same period, been appointed to Irish post offices. I am not able to state the nationality of these officers.

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman insist on them having a knowledge of the Irish language?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have already said I cannot do that.

Sir Horace Rumbold's Reminiscences.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Sir Horace Rumbold, lately His Majesty's Ambassador at Vienna, and now in receipt of a pension out of public moneys, had the sanction of His Majesty's Government in publishing a volume of reminiscences containing private conversations and other matters relating to countries to which he was accredited.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): No application was made by Sir Horace Rumbold for the sanction of His Majesty's Government. But in cases where the reminiscences are not of recent date, and are confined to personal incidents and matters of public notoriety, such sanction has not apparently been considered essential. Any such publication by a former representative of this country without the leave of the Secretary of State, would, if it related to recent events which have come under the writer's notice in the course of his official duties, be most reprehensible, and His Majesty's Government are considering whether it will not be advisable to take steps in order to leave no room for doubt as to the manner in which they regard the subject.

Land Grants in British East African Protectorates.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the conditions on which land is granted to intending settlers in the Protectorates of British East Africa and Uganda; whether any land is granted freehold; what is the maximum period for which leases are granted; and whether he has any official communications on these points from the Chief Commissioners of those Protectorates.

*LORD CRANBORNE: I shall be happy to give the hon. Gentleman a copy of the East African Crown Lands Ordinance, 1902, which will give him a great deal of the information he requires. The corresponding Ordinance for Uganda has not yet been enacted.

Larbert Railway Accident.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the train which left Kyle at 11.25 a.m., on 30th July last, was delayed through a breakdown or collision at Larbert; and will he state whether a Board of Trade inquiry has been held in regard to the cause of the accident; and, if so, with what result.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The accident in question was duly notified to the Board of Trade, and upon consideration of the information supplied, the Board were advised that the case was not one in which it was necessary to order an official inquiry.

District Council Building Bye-Laws.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the conditions and restrictions placed upon the erection of cottages by the District Councils render it practically impossible to build them; and will he state by what rules the Local Government Board are guided in approving the bye-laws proposed by these Councils.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): My right hon. friend has asked me to answer the question in his absence. I am not aware that the building of cottages has become a practical impossibility owing to the conditions and restrictions imposed by District Councils, but my attention has been drawn to some cases where difficulty has been experienced on account of the requirements of the building bye-laws in force. In approving bye-laws with respect to new buildings, the Local Government Board are chiefly concerned to see that they are such as the local authority may legally make, and are sufficient to secure proper conditions, especially as regards stability and sanitation. I am not in a position to state what bye-laws are needed in particular districts. The responsibility rests with the District Council in each instance of determining what bye-laws they will propose. Notice is given in the district by advertisements before bye-laws are confirmed, and any objections made to me with regard to them would have my careful consideration. I may add that I have recently issued a modified code of model bye-laws for use in rural districts which are specially suited for these districts, and from which are omitted certain requirements usually in force in urban districts.

Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that since the opening of the Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, after providing for working expenses, there has been a surplus profit in each half year, and that prior to the opening of the line the guaranteeing area had to provide certain sums for dividends on the £5,000 baronial guaranteed shares; and, seeing that, notwithstanding Section 5 of The Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883, up to the present the surplus profits have been divided between the working company and the Treasury, will he take steps to have the provisions of the Act enforced in this case.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham): The answer to the first question is in the affirmative. I understand that the County Council of Donegal paid interest amounting to £91 18s. 2d. to the Lough Swilly Co. in respect of the half year ended 31st December, 1900, and £100 in respect of the half year ended 30th June, 1901. The Board of Works were no parties to this arrangement. The Board are advised that the county was not bound to make any payment under the guarantee until after the line was opened, and that payments made for a period anterior to the opening of the line were voluntary payments not contemplated by the Tramways Act of 1883, and consequently that Section 5 of the Tramways Act of 1883 does not apply.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Seeing that the Treasury have received a portion of the money which should not have been paid, will it refund it to the county?

MR. HAYES FISHER: I will consider that.

Tolsta (Island of Lewis) School.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the number of children who are on the register of the public school at Tolsta, Island of Lewis, the period the school has been closed during the last six months, and the cause.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The number of pupils on the register of the public school at Tolsta at the end of the last school year was 196. The school was closed on the 3rd July by order of the Medical Officer of Health owing to an outbreak of typhoid fever. No notice of its being re-opened has been received. (13th November, 1902.)

Southwark Denominational Schools.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the West Salford Division whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners applied last year to the rebuilding of certain denominational schools in Southwark a sum of £1,500 derived from funds belonging to the ecclesiastical branch of the City Parochial Charities Fund, which is prescribed by the City Parochial Charities Act, 1883, to be applied only to the maintenance of the fabric of churches and other ecclesiastical purposes; and, if so, in view of the provisions of the Act, will he explain why such action has been sanctioned.

*MR. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): The objects to which the funds paid to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the City Parochial Charities Act may be applied are by the Act described in such terms as to leave to the Commissioners a wider discretion than would appear from ne hon. Member's Question, and, taking into consideration the special needs of the schools referred to in the Question. and the wants of the parish served by them, the Board considered the grant to be a legitimate application of a part of those funds.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: It is specifically stated that the funds are to be applied to ecclesiastical purposes.

*Mr LEES KNOWLES: The hon. Gentleman's paraphrase has narrowed the meaning of the section.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): As I was responsible for the drafting of this Act, may I ask on which words the hon. Gentleman relies?

*Mr. LEES KNOWLES: The terms are rather lengthy.

Mr. BRYCE: Will the hon. Gentleman be good enough to read the terms?

*Mr. LEES KNOWLES: Yes, the terms are as follows—

> "To be applied" (by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners) "to the maintenance of the fabric of churches or to the better endowment of existing benefices, or to giving theological instruction to persons preparing for holy orders, or generally to extending the benefit of clerical or spiritual ministrations in accordance with the doctrines or by the ministers of the Church of England as by law established in the more populous districts of the metropolis."

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Perhaps I may explain that I proposed to include the words in my Question, but the Clerk at the Table thought it too long, and I therefore had to paraphrase it.

*Mr. LEES KNOWLES: I regret that the paraphrase is not wide enough.

Countesthorpe School Board.

Mr. LOGAN (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he is aware that three letters, dated 29th September, 20th October, and 3rd November respectively, have been sent to the Board of Education by Mr. W. H. Herbert, a member of the Countesthorpe (Leicestershire) School Board, a ratepayer in that parish, complaining that his child, aged six years, has been expelled from the board school, by a resolution of the School Board, carried by the casting vote of the chairman, the vicar of the parish (although there are vacant places in the board school), with the object of compelling him, a Nonconformist, to send his child to the Church of England school in the parish; and, seeing that up to the present Mr. Herbert has received only formal acknowledgments of the receipt of his letters, if he will state what steps the Board of Education proposes to take to protect the rights of this parent, and to prevent a recurrence of such cases. In putting the Question, may I express my regret that there is an inaccuracy in it as it appears on the Paper. I understand that the vicar, although the chairman of the Board, was not in the chair at the time of the occurrence.

The SECRETARY of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): The Board of Education have been in communication with the School Board on the subject. This was explained to Mr. Herbert in reply to his second letter. There is no accommodation for infants at the Countesthorpe board school. If the infant referred to is qualified for promotion at the end of the school year (December 31st), it will be admitted to the board school as an "older scholar." The Board of Education are not aware of any special reason for its earlier promotion, but further inquiry will be made. The hon. Member has been good enough to explain to me that the vicar was not present at the meeting of the School Board when the vote was taken.

Education Bill—Transferred Denominational Schools.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether under the Education Bill an elementary school built by voluntary subscribers, but leased to a School Board, would have the status of a school provided by the education authority, or of a school not provided by the education authority; and what would be the position of such a school after the lease has terminated.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: A school leased to a local education authority will be deemed to be a school provided by that authority. The latter part of the hon. Member's Question was answered by the First Lord of the Treasury in his reply to the Member for Denbighshire West on 5th November.†

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): Arising out of that answer, may I ask whether, in view of the great public interest taken in this question, and the fact that Amendments dealing with it have been closured, an opportunity will be given for the full discussion of the transfer of schools.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I cannot on behalf of the Government give an undertaking to that effect. The matter has been very fully discussed.

Limavady Sessions—Henry and others v. Hamill and Moody.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Henry and others v. Hamill and Moody at the recent quarter sessions in Limavady; and whether, in view of the rights of property involved and which were left undecided, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): This was a civil action, and an appeal to the Judge of Assizes has been lodged. Even independently of this latter circumstance, it is not a case for the intervention of the Executive.

Londonderry and Donegal Union Boundaries.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when the Irish Local Government Board propose to hold the inquiry, already promised by them, with reference to the change of union boundaries in the counties of Londonderry and Donegal.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Before taking further action in the matter, the Board considers it desirable that the recently elected local bodies, who are affected by the proposal, should have an opportunity of expressing their views upon it.

Roscrea Petty Sessional Bench.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a prosecution by the inspector of weights and measures at the last Roscrea Petty Sessions, when one of the presiding magistrates charged a solicitor with trying to upset the Court, and then left the Bench, so that the case could not be proceeded with; and whether, to prevent in the future inconvenience, he will recommend the Lord Chancellor to appoint more justices of the peace in this district.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that there are usually five or six magistrates in attendance at these sessions, and that it rarely happens that only two are present. Applications for appointments to the commission should be made to the lieutenant of the county

Dispensary Doctors as County Councillors.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Local Government Board issued a sealed order prohibiting the election of dispensary doctors as county councillors; why was this order cancelled and a new sealed order issued declaring that no county councillor shall be qualified to be or continue as a poor law medical officer.

MR. WYNDHAM: Both orders were made by the Board in the interests of the sick and destitute poor. The first order was rescinded in order to substitute the second, which secures the same object in a more correct manner.

Teaching of the Irish Language.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what are the regulations that prevent the Department of Agriculture sanctioning the expenditure of funds by the Agricultural and Technical Instruction Committees of County Councils in the furtherance of instruction in the Irish language; and whether he proposes to remedy this matter.

---

† See page 149.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There are no specific regulations of the kind referred to. Every application to the Department for such assistance is dealt with according to the particular circumstances of the case.

Belfast Police.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland how many police barracks are there in Belfast; the number of sergeants in each; and to what denomination do they belong.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This information cannot conveniently be given in the form of an answer to a Question, and I have, therefore, communicated it to my hon. friend.

Drogheda School Teacher.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any reply has been made to the complaint of the Rev. J. Curry, P.P., Drogheda, that the head teacher of the school of which he is manager has been subjected by the new rules to a loss of £50 a year; and if he can state how similar complaints from other clerical managers and teachers in Ireland have been dealt with.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I received a letter from Father Curry, dated October 30th, and sent him an acknowledgment. I have since made an exhaustive examination into the cases submitted. I cannot undertake, as a general rule, to correspond at length over questions of administration with which the National Board is charged by statute. But, as these cases are typical, I propose to send the result of my inquiry to the rev. gentleman.

Use of Irish Courthouses by Rural District Councils.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief ecretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of courthouses the use of which has been refused by the authorities to Rural District Councils for their quarterly meetings or road sessions; and whether the use of these buildings was refused to presentment sessions for meetings for road business prior to 1889.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The District Councils have no legal right to the use of courthouses. In some few instances, I believe, the high sheriffs and magistrates, the proper authorities, have, for reasons which appeared to them adequate, refused the District Councils permission to use these courthouses. But I have no information before me which would enable me to give a more definite reply to either part of the Question.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. Tully—

Mr. WYNDHAM said the County Councils had a right to the use of the courthouses, subject to certain statutory limitations, but District Councils had no such right.

Irish Union Amalgamation.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from Strokestown Union, and also from unions in the county Leitrim, resolutions in favour of union amalgamation; and whether, in view of the importance of this question in Ireland, he will appoint a Commission to inquire into it, with power to dissolve unions that are no longer necessary.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Such resolutions have been received. The general question of union amalgamation has engaged the attention of the Local Government Board, and investigations have been in progress for some time past. The matter is admittedly one of much importance, and I shall consider during the Recess the means best adapted to attain the object in view.

Mr. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman be prepared to receive a deputation from the unions interested?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I could not receive a deputation before January. If the hon. Member will communicate with me I will consider the matter.

Mr. Joseph Macauley, J.P.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a speech reported to have been delivered by a Mr. Joseph Macauley, J.P., at Belfast Water Board, on 6th inst., where it was proposed to present an address to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and what action, if any, the Government intend taking in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have seen a newspaper report of the speech in question. The Executive is only concerned with speeches that involve a breach of the law.

MR. SLOAN: Do I understand that a disloyal speech made against the Crown by a J.P. is not a direct violation of the obligation taken by him?

MR. WYNDHAM: I think the hon. Member will see that we cannot discuss by way of Question and answer the exact character of the speech. It involved no breach of the law.

MR. TULLY: Has the right hon. Gentleman read the violent speeches of Orange magistrates?

Carndonagh Mail Service.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether complaints have been received by the Post Office authorities with reference to the late delivery of letters in Carndonagh and district since the railway company began to convey the mails to that town from Londonderry; whether the mail service since the opening of the new Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway costs the Post Office less now than formerly; and whether he will arrange for the arrival of the mails at Carndonagh earlier than they arrive at present.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Inquiry is being made on the subject, and an answer shall be sent to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

Education Bill Rate.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the product of the penny rate referred to in the Amendment to the Education Bill, put down by him after Clause 10 of the Bill, is intended to be the product of a penny rate charged on the full assessment of the rateable property of the area rated, or only the product of the penny rate after the allowance of half the amount on agricultural land has been made.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The answer to my hon. friend is that the latter of the two alternatives that he suggests is the correct one.

Proposed Ministry of Commerce.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the desirability of the appointment of a Minister of Commerce, or of such a reform of the Board of Trade as to meet the demands of the commercial community of this country, that questions of trade and commerce shall be administered by a Minister equipped with greater powers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to the Question of my hon. friend, I have to say that I think I have indicated on previous occasions, and in reply to Questions from other quarters of the House, that I do not see that the position of the Board of Trade could be dealt with in isolation or apart from the general consideration of the position of the various Government offices. I am not quite sure what additional powers my hon. friend refers to in the last paragraph of his Question.

Naval Administration.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the failures of vessels of His Majesty's Navy, both when under trial and at sea, and the number of new vessels now condemned to costly repairs; also taking into consideration the cost of repairs as given in the late Return on Navy Boilers, he will consider the desirability of instituting by Royal Commission an inquiry into the Admiralty administration of naval affairs, especially as regards types of vessels, machinery, guns, men, and reserves.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman complains of the boiler policy of the Admiralty in the first part of the Question, and on that subject there has been a Committee of Inquiry, as he knows. I think the fact that, in the hon. Gentleman's judgment, the boiler policy of the Admiralty is not a satisfactory one, is hardly a sufficient reason for demanding a Royal Commission to inquire into the general administration of naval affairs—"types of vessels, machinery, guns, men, and reserves." It seems to go a good deal beyond boilers.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: May I say I am not dealing with boilers exclusively. Am I to understand that the Government will do nothing to restore the confidence of the country in the Navy and its administration?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope that that confidence still remains unshaken, but, if it be shaken, I am very confident that a Royal Commission will not restore it.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.]

Clause 13:—

Amendment proposed.

"In page 5, line 21, after the word 'council,' to insert the words 'including the reasonable travelling expenses of the members of the Education Committee.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the first word 'the,' and insert the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Question again proposed, "That the first word 'the' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

(2.40.) **THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD** (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said that when the Committee adjourned on the preceding night they were in the midst of a very interesting debate. He had found it impossible to reply in a word or two to the suggestions put forward from both sides of the House, and he therefore now proposed to state as briefly as he could the view of the Government on the present proposal. They shared as fully as anybody the desire that the attendance of all classes on the governing bodies should be as regular as possible. But he was bound to look at this question from the general point of view of local government. Hon. Gentlemen had sought to prove that there was a distinction between the committee of the local education authority and the committees of other bodies. So no doubt there was, but he doubted very much whether the distinction told in favour of the Amendment now under discussion. They had been told that it was very desirable that working men, whose interest in the educational system of their districts was very great, he might say greater than that of any other class, should be on the committee, but they were also told that the position of the education committee was one entirely subordinate to the local education authority. It was not the controlling body that was to be strengthened by the addition of working class members, it was only the intermediate authority. He thought that told rather against the Amendment than for it. He must ask the Committee not to be misled on this matter. If this proposal was adopted they would open a door which they would not be able to shut again. It was not for him to dictate to the Committee as to whether the change would be for better or for worse. But he had had some experience of local government, and he would ask whether there were not many men claiming to represent this or that particular interest, but not belonging to the industrial classes, who would be attracted to these governing bodies directly they were sure they would be relieved of all costs. No doubt the proposal before the Committee was a guarded one, but how were they going to keep it within such narrow limits? They were asked to only sanction reasonable travelling expenses. What were the travelling expenses of a member of the committee? Was it realised that in many of these cases miles of roads had to be travelled over—that frequently it entailed a journey the day before? [Cheers.] He appreciated those cheers. It made the position of the workman harder still, but the real difficulty was not the expenses. There was also the loss of one or two days work. There were committees of the County Council whose work, in his judgment, was quite as important—in the interests of the working classes—as that of a committee of the local education authority. Let them take the case of the Lunatic Asylums Committee. In the work of that body the working man had a special interest. The asylums were often situated in a distant corner of the county, but the committee had to meet regularly, and its members had to travel long journeys in order to get there. Their proceedings were keenly watched by the working classes, whose relatives had unfortunately so often to take refuge within the walls of the institution. The members of the committee were not reimbursed their expenses. [Cries of "They are paid."] No, travelling expenses were only paid in cases where the asylum or workhouse was outside the county area, and where the members of the committee had consequently to travel beyond that area. They received nothing when they merely had to travel from their own homes to a place within the county area.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): Under the schemes passed under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, third class travelling expenses are paid to members attending not only the meetings of the central board, but also the meetings of the county governing bodies.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he was not aware of that. He was dealing with the local authorities which were within the cognisance of his Department, and with which he had personal contact. He might take another illustration. Hon. Members familiar with the North of England, knew that there were many unions where the guardians had miles of roads to traverse in order to get to workhouses near to which there was no railway station. They had to attend a variety of committees, but they were not paid their expenses. He was not arguing against the principle of reasonable travelling expenses, but he was trying to point out that there was a practical difficulty in limiting the expenses in the way proposed in this Amendment. It was not for him nor for the Government to ask the Committee not to take this step if they thought it a right step to take. But let them take it with their eyes open, and not, as they were asked to take it on the previous night, on the ground that this proposal could be limited within these narrow lines. This proposal was far too serious for the Government, to give their assent to it. There were no exceptional circumstances in regard to the education committee which did not apply to other committees. If this proposal was adopted, he thought they would find that pressure would be exercised to grant the same privileges to members of other local authorities, and that pressure they would not be able to resist. Then it would be but a short step to the House of Commons. Hitherto they had successfully, and as he believed rightly, resisted all proposals to cast on public funds the costs incurred by men who were members of these local governing bodies. If they now gave way in this case they would be unable to stop at the payment of travelling expenses; every man who devoted himself to local or public service would expect to have extended to him the right to payment of all out-of-pocket expenses. This was therefore a much wider question than that of the local education committees, and he would ask the Committee not on this occasion by a side wind to upset the principle which Parliament had hitherto upheld, but to adhere to the sound principle that those who took part in local or Imperial government should do so with all the risks and loss that the service entailed.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said the argument of the right hon. Gentleman meant that it was impossible that men of humble means could take part in the administration of this Act. [Ministerial cries of "Nothing of the kind."] The right hon. Gentleman agreed that long distances would have to be travelled, and that men of humble means would not be able to undertake the work.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman entirely misrepresented what he had said. He had pointed out that the expenses could not be limited as it was proposed to limit them in this Amendment. Men of the very class the right hon. Gentleman alluded to found means of attending the meetings of Boards of Guardians without having their expenses paid.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said men of humble means could not afford to travel long distances by train or carriage. To his mind the interruption of the hon. Member for the Flint Boroughs disposed of the whole argument of the right hon. Gentleman. This terrible precedent which was to ruin our local administration had been in operation for a considerable time in Wales. There they had long distances to travel, and railway communication was by no means easy. It seemed to him to be a simple proposition. What was there in it to give rise to this alarm? He thought the Committee would do extremely well to accept the Amendment.

MR. MILVAIN (Hampstead) said the argument of the last speaker reminded him of the tale of the little boy who when remonstrated with for putting out his tongue to his master replied that it was only a little one. He could not help thinking that those who were advocating the payment of these expenses out of the rates had their little tongues in their cheek. He was strongly opposed to the Amendment. In his estimation, working men were a fetish, unduly worshipped in this House. But by this Amendment it was proposed to pay the travelling expenses, not of working men, but of the committee, and these expenses might include their day's work and their food. If they sanctioned the payment of the expenses of members of our representative institutions, they opened the floodgates of unlimited expense. Hon. Members opposite claimed "economy" and "efficiency" as their watchwords. Where was the economy to be found in paying the expenses of their representatives on representative institutions? He could not see it in view of the fact that there were so many men of leisure and ability willing to do the work for nothing. This proposal had been made before, and always successfully resisted on the ground that it was not consistent with economy. If it was admitted now it would be without precedent, and would be admitted for the first time in the legislation of this House. If they paid the expenses of the education committees it would conduce not to efficiency but to jobbery; it might lead to outside influences being brought to bear on the County Councils to elect a class of man whose services would not conduce to efficiency. Upon these grounds he should vote against the Amendment.

* MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes) said this was a matter of vital importance to working men and people with small means, and he had always contended that the parents of the children who went to these schools should be able to see that the education given to their children was such as they approved of, and this it was quite impossible for them to do unless the Bill was amended in the direction proposed. It was stated that the payment of travelling expneses was introducing a new principle; but on the London County Council the committees had conveyances supplied to carry them round on inspection work, and when railways were more convenient for the purpose of conveyance in carrying out inspection railway fares were paid. Had this been a question of payment for services on the committee he should not have supported the Amendment, but this was a case of enabling the parents of the children to serve on the committees, and it was on that ground that he supported it.

* (3.5.) SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) expressed his regret that the President of the Local Government Board should have run away immediately after having fired his shot, because he had made a confident statement which ought to receive an answer, and which would receive an answer that he ought to have stayed to hear. The right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire who followed the right hon. Gentleman dealt with the subject generally and not specifically with regard to the present case. The hon. Member opposite and the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board both took the line which was familiar to all Government Departments. It was the line adopted by the Treasury with regard to every proposal made to them. The consecrated phrase of the Treasury to all the other Departments who made these

proposals was not couched in very good language. It was, "These proposals would open a very serious door." He would be glad to see the "very serious door" opened to which the right hon. Gentleman objected. He would go even further. As a specific proposal this was much stronger than any other. In the case of Durham the county town was almost in the centre of the county, and around that town were a great many mines. The result was that the hon. Member for Mid Durham, and many miners of that district, were able to serve on the County Council; but in many mining counties School Boards were elected for particular districts, and on those boards admirable work was done. The parents of the children in the mining districts were keener about education than anybody else in those districts, and by the abolition of the School Boards these men would be knocked out of education altogether. The object of the Amendment was to retain the services of these men. The right hon. Gentleman was guilty of an error when he said there was no precedent for this; there was the Welsh precedent, and there was also the precedent that some members of the Fisheries Board were paid their expenses. This, therefore, was a practical Amendment. With regard to the Amendment to the Amendment, although, for convenience, a general discussion was being taken upon it, he thought the mover ought to say clearly how it was going to be dealt with. He was not quite clear as to its effect; if it allowed the counties to pick and choose it would be most objectionable. [AN HON. MEMBER: That is what it does do!] If that was so, then, of course, it ought to be opposed. Those who had been able to pay their own expenses and who acted outside the area for local authorities had generally thought it their duty to accept their expenses along with the others, because they thought the question of expenses should be a general and not a particular one. The point upon which the President of the Local Government Board relied was merely technical. If a member of a Board of Guardians in the south-west of London paid a visit to the north-east of London, his expenses were paid. Surely a similar course might be taken in a large county where the distances and the time occupied were much greater. It was not right to use the merely technical objection that in the former case the visit was outside the district. Many School Board areas would, under this Bill, be embraced within the new district—the county—and therefore members would have to travel altogether outside the existing districts. It was really on the lines of present practice to apply the Amendment to cases of that kind. On the grounds he had stated he should oppose the Amendment to the Amendment, and support the original proposal.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that when his hon. and learned friend moved the Amendment to the Amendment on the previous night there was a considerable measure of agreement or approval on the Government side of the House, and no distinct expression of disagreement on the other side. It appeared now, however, that his hon. and learned friend was between the upper and nether millstones, inasmuch as his proposal neither commanded agreement on that side nor met with acceptance on the other. At the same time it was a most sensible and reasonable Amendment. There had been brought before the Committee two attitudes of mind, with neither of which he was able to sympathise or agree. The first was that of the President of the Local Government Board, who used the "open door" argument—that they were opening a door which they would never be able to shut. The door was, in fact, already open, and the present was not the period in our history in which to talk about the "thin end of the wedge." There were no great questions in which the thin end of the wedge had not already been inserted. The other attitude of mind was that of Labour members, who declared they were not ashamed to say they needed the money, but they would be ashamed to take it unless those who did not need it were also made to take it. That was a fantastic proposition to which very few Members on that side of the House, no matter how progressive their views might be, would be inclined to assent. Practically two considerations were before the Committee, each of which was complicated and controversial, and each supported by a considerable body of opinion. The first was that they did not want to settle the great question of the payment of representatives on a side and comparatively small issue on an Education Bill. They, on that side, would not shrink from a settlement of that question. But he, personally, would draw a great distinction between travelling expenses and remuneration for actual services, whether in regard to Members of Parliament or members of local bodies. The second consideration had been urged by almost every speaker in the debate. The schools concerned were the schools attended by the children of the people in humble circumstances, and if there was any board upon which the working classes ought to be represented it was the education authority. It was quite evident, however, that it would be impossible for them to be so represented unless their travelling expenses to and from the place of meeting were defrayed. These two considerations came into collision, and out of that collision the present question arose. How were the two points of view to be reconciled? How were the poorer members of these authorities to be enabled to attend to their duties without at the same time conceding or affirming the great principle of the payment of representatives? The Amendment of his hon. and learned friend presented a safe, easy, clear, convenient, and suitable method of solving the problem. It conceded no great principle; it affirmed no small principle that had not already been conceded. On the other hand, it dealt with the immediate emergency, removed the actual concrete grievance operated through the very authority the Bill proposed to set up, and acted in a spirit of compromise which harmonised with the general principle of a Bill which in itself was a great compromise. If this half-way measure, this friendly and conciliatory Amendment, was to be treated with disdain and contumely by hon. Gentlemen opposite, he should certainly urge his hon. and learned friend not to press it, and then they on that side would have to go into the Division Lobby against the other side on the main principle. If, however, the Opposition were prepared to accept this reasonable concession, they would meet with a certain amount of support on that side of the House.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said that the Amendment to the Amendment, as interpreted by its mover, was one which many on that side could not accept. It would lead to diversity of practice in different parts of the country.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Does not the hon. Member trust the discretion of the local authorities?

SIR WALTER FOSTER said the discretion of every local authority would be influenced by local circumstances; and they would have a practice adopted on one side of the boundary which was not followed on the other, and friction and discontent would be the result. Private arrangements of this sort, in which money passed from one to another, were not desirable in the carrying on of local government except under uniform rules. He supported the original Amendment on the same ground as the President of the Local Government Board opposed it, viz., in the interests of local government. In numerous instances, efficient representatives had been obliged to give up their seats on County and Rural District Councils because they could not afford the travelling expenses and also the time to attend, and local government necessarily became less efficient in consequence. The question of the education of the children of the people was a wider interest than any other matter of local government, inasmuch as it affected every family in the land. The management of lunatic asylums was not a fair parallel case, as that had to be carried on by specially qualified men, and only affected relatively few people. Many of the men who had served on the School Boards would be disfranchised from serving on the education committees, because of their inability to sit on the councils, and because working men could not afford to go from one end of the county to the other. He should certainly vote for the Amendment, because it would satisfy a just and righteous claim, and add to the efficiency of the education authority. He hoped the First Lord of the Treasury, if he spoke again, would support the view of finding some way out of the difficulty in which they were placed.

(3.30.) MR. WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said the right hon. Gentleman had told them that this was part of a large matter. He wished to ask the Committee where was this matter going to stop? It would stop in this House and not before. If they were going to pay these particular men and women to come forward and offer their services, why should they not pay other men and other women who came forward? If they did that well and good. He warned the Committee that if they adopted this proposal it would not stop there. The President of the Local Government Board told them that the Amendment would open the door to a dangerous precedent. In this case he was not in favour of the policy of the open door.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said he was anxious that the Committee should not give up the Amendment to the Amendment in a hurry. He was of the opinion that his hon. and learned friend had put a wrong interpretation upon this proposal. In order to make the meaning clear he suggested the insertion of the word "all." It would then read—

> "Including such reasonable travelling expenses of all the members of the education committee as the local education authority may think fit."

Personally he was quite prepared to accept the words as they stood.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the Division may very shortly be taken. Perhaps the Committee will think it only respectful that I should say one or two words upon the questions which have been raised. I am sorry that I was not present during the debate last night, as I should like to have heard the speeches, especially those made by hon. Gentlemen who claim, and claim justly, to specially represent the working classes, which I am informed were not only speeches of great ability but also showed great moderation. I had not that good fortune, and therefore I speak under that disadvantage. I really have only two points to urge upon the Committee. One is this: If you mean to make a great change in the existing practice with regard to the payment of expenses of persons serving upon public bodies is this Education Bill a convenient place to do it? [OPPOSITION cries of "Yes, it is."] I am aware that an hon. friend of mine below the gangway, and hon. Gentlemen opposite say that this is no innovation, and that it has already been made in the case of the Welsh Intermediate Education scheme and in the case of the London Government Bill. I do not think either of those measures is on all fours with the present scheme. In the first place the Welsh Intermediate scheme is different from this because it says that a third-class ticket is to be paid for from station to station, and that by no means covers the ground of expenses. That was not introduced in the debate on the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, but it was accepted as part of a scheme brought forward under the Act. That is very different from a precedent deliberately adopted by this House with regard to any great question of local government. The other question, I am distinctly informed by the President of the Local Government Board, is really no precedent at all, and if that takes place which my hon. friend tells us upon his authority, and from his own knowledge, does take place on the London County Council the London County Council are breaking the law and they are liable to be surcharged by some future Mr. Cockerton. So much for the two precedents which have been alleged. I think it will be admitted that they are hardly in front. I bring the Committee back to this: you are attempting to initiate a very great change in our practice as regards local government. Is this Education Bill an occasion to do it? I venture very strongly to urge upon the Committee that it is a most inconvenient occasion, partly because this Bill surely arouses enough controversies without importing this into it; and also because this Bill alone among local government Bills does give the smaller localities and parishes of all classes special opportunities of taking their share in the work of education. Let the Committee remember that while the committee whose expenses are to be met is only an advisory committee, and advisory upon general principles, the actual management of the school rests, in the case of voluntary schools or non-provided schools, in a body of managers, necessarily local, one of which will be appointed by the minor local authority, the Parish Council or District Council, and the other will be appointed, no doubt, by the education authority, and they will probably appoint somebody intimately acquainted with the details of the work of that district and capable of attending, without great personal sacrifices, to the work. That is the case of the non-provided schools. As to the provided schools, it rests entirely with the education authority, who can take care—and certainly will take care—that the parents of the children will have an adequate opportunity of taking their share in the management. Therefore, I should say that of all Bills touching on local government this is the very last Bill upon which you ought to make this change, because the grievance which the hon. Gentleman so eloquently refers to exists in a far less degree than it does in any other county or borough work. There is one other reason which I will venture to urge upon the Committee, and it is that this is a very bad occasion on which to make this change. Last night we had a great debate in regard to the burden thrown upon the ratepayers by this Bill. I have never denied that the ratepayers of counties would desire to see the teachers better paid, and the schools better equipped than they are now, but when I have uttered these educational prophecies I have been met by the answer that the ratepayers will be so reluctant to pay that they will starve the schools. I do not think they will, but I do think that an Amendment of this kind increases the temptation thrown upon them to starve education. Remember also that every shilling you take out of the rates for the purpose of paying the travelling expenses of members is money taken away from the higher purposes of education, which this Bill is intended to serve, and I would seriously suggest to the Committee that it is most unwise for us to make the burden thrown upon the rates by this Bill heavier and more onerous than it would otherwise be. The Committee will observe that I have carefully refrained from making any pronouncement upon the broad question of this Amendment. It is far too large a question to be touched upon at the end of an enormous discussion like that which has taken place upon this Bill. Let the House, when the proper occasion comes, deal with it as a whole as affecting every branch of public administration, and affecting both local and Imperial government, but do not take this occasion of the thirty-ninth day of the Committee stage of this Bill to initiate for the first time in our County Councils and municipal legislation, a change which must inevitably have such far-reaching effects in the future.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said they were very familiar with the argument about the proper occasion, for it was an occasion which never came. He remembered that when they were discussing the Scotch Local Government Bill of 1888, the First Lord of the Treasury told them that that was not the proper occasion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That was a much better occasion than this.

Mr. BRYCE said he would try to give, in two or three words, the reasons why they thought this was the proper occasion. They were by this Bill extinguishing School Boards in small areas, upon which poor people who could not pay travelling expenses could sit.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: But they can sit on the boards of management.

Mr. BRYCE contended that by this Bill they were depriving the people who had hitherto had a chance of regulating the education of their own children of the opportunity which they had up to the present enjoyed. The right hon. Gentleman said they had the boards of management. Did he remember the discussions which took place on Clause 8? He considered it essential that on these education committees, which were to have practically the bulk of the work, some opportunity should be given to the parents to bear the part in the work which they had hitherto done under the School Board system. They had been told that by adopting this Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the Barnstaple Division they would take a step which would have consequences in the future. That was an argument they had often heard, but his answer to it was this. They were asked for the sake of a possibly distant object, a consequence which might not arise in our time, a consequence which would have to be determined by totally different arguments, to sacrifice an opportunity of making these bodies much more effective than they otherwise would be by admitting people to work in which they were interested, and who were anxious, as well as competent, to discharge it.

*(3.47.) MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) said it was a fact that the Sheffield School Board and most other School Boards had habitually paid for conveyances for members when travelling around inspecting sites and schools. The same remark applied to cases where Sheffield magistrates visited public-houses in connection with licensing matters. The President of the Local Government Board was entirely wrong (and the Prime Minister was wrong in following him) in supposing that there were not lots of precedents all over the country for a proposal such as that now before the Committee.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said if they were going to divide they should not vote in the dark. His hon. and learned friend said that the County Council would have the right of picking and choosing. The Committee ought to know whether that was a proper construction of the words before voting. His opinion was that there would be no discussion in the County Council at all. He asked the Attorney General to state whether in his opinion that was the proper reading of the words.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked whether in the event of the rejection of these two Amendments there would be power under the scheme to provide for the payment of travelling expenses? Would the Government consider that they had the right under the Bill to sanction payment of travelling expenses where the County Council desired it? The Prime Minister tried to conjure up the bogey of the rates. One experience was worth all the arguments of the Prime Minister on that point. They had power in Wales to pay the travelling expenses of the members of the governing body. He knew a county where the total travelling expenses, third class, amounted in a single year to less than one-fiftieth of a penny on the rates. It was misleading to talk to the Committee about the burden on the rates in a matter of this sort, when the Prime Minister was introducing a Bill which would involve a rate of 4½d. in Gloucestershire, 6d. in Liverpool, and 1s. in some districts, in order to keep up sectarian schools.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he had been asked to state his opinion in regard to the construction to be put on the Amendment. He did think that the words were not very clear, but he would be inclined to say that the proper construction was that which the author of the Amendment had put on it, namely, that the County Council would have a discretion to pay all, or only some, of the travelling expenses, as they deemed fit. With regard to the other question, he was not sufficiently familiar with the provisions in Wales, to enable him to give an offhand answer to the question the hon. Member had put to him, but he thought there would be no general power under the Act to introduce a provision into a scheme dealing with this matter. He would be glad to go into the question with the hon. Member, but he was not prepared off-hand to give an opinion on a point of this kind, which involved special consideration.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Does that mean that in the opinion of the Attorney General there will be no power to introduce into a scheme a provision for the payment of even third class travelling expenses in England?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I do not think there will be.

Question, "That the first word 'the,' stand part of the proposed Amendment," put, and negatived.

Amendment further amended, by inserting—

"After the word 'including,' the word such,' and by inserting, after the word 'committee,' the words 'as the local education authority may think fit.'"—*Mr. Lyttelton.*

(3.53.) Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 130; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 503.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. (Munro(Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kemp, George
Kitson, Sir John
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Malcolm, Ian
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Soares and Mr. Lyttelton.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow)
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple Sir Charles
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh.
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(4.5.) Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford), in moving the next Amendment, said that he represented the largest division in this country, and an ever-increasing one, and he ventured to say that this Bill had not been drafted to meet the case of his constituents, who would suffer much under its provisions. It was said that the ratepayers would profit more under the Imperial grants than before, but in his case nothing of the kind would occur. The district would be poorer and the Imperial grant would be less under the Bill unless a number of Amendments were made in this Clause. At the present time 97 per cent. of the children in the district were educated in board schools, and only 3 per cent. in the voluntary schools. The result was that the district would have to provide an additional school rate of a farthing. In framing the Bill no consideration had been shown for extreme cases. He noticed that the education rate would be levied on the basis of the district rate instead of the poor rate.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Only in one case.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR said that there was an Amendment lower down on the Paper which would remove the rate from the basis of assessment for the poor rate to that of the district rate. The East India Docks, under the Public Health Act, would be assessed on £14,000 instead of on £27,000, which they now paid; and the Great Eastern Railway, instead of being assessed on £9,900, would be assessed on only £2,600. The result would be that the houses of only £10 rental would have to make up the deficiency. The result would be inefficiency, the schools would be starved, and many people would not pay their rates. He knew that his was an extreme case, where the population had increased from 8,000 to over 100,000, but in framing a Bill of this magnitude care should have been taken so that no anomaly would occur in the way of increased burdens. He appealed to his right hon. friend in charge of the Bill to so amend the Clause that in extreme cases, like that presented by his constituency, the ratepayers would not be put into a worse position than before.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, after the word 'Council,' to insert the words 'shall be paid under this Act out of a rate levied by the Council on the basis of the assessment for the poor rate.'"—(*Mr. Louis Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That those words e there inserted."

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not quite follow his hon. friend in his reference to an especial hardship on a particular district. He admitted, however, that there was a flaw in the proposal in the Bill in regard to the incidence of the rate. That was not altogether the fault of those who were responsible for the Bill. It had probably escaped his hon. friend's attention that, under the Technical Instruction Act, the rate which could be levied was, in the case of urban sanitary districts, which were the local authorities for the purpose, the only general rate which existed in them, viz., the sanitary rate, which was liable to deduction in regard to railways, canals, etc. It was thought at first that it was better to leave things as they were; but the Government realised later that it would be a grave injustice if, in the area of a Borough or a County Council the incidence of the rate was to be the poor rate subject only to ordinary deductions, while in sanitary districts it was to be the sanitary rate. His hon. friend said that the Amendment in the name of the Secretary to the Board of Education would not altogether meet the case. On the contrary, that Amendment met the case more completely and fully than did the Amendment of his hon. friend. The variation was not great, and he ventured to hope that his hon. friend and other hon. Members who had similar Amendments on the Paper, would be willing to withdraw them, and allow the Amendment of his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education to be put from the Chair. The only real difference between the Amendments was one of detail, and not of principle. They all sought to effect the same result, namely, to make the incidence of the rate for education the poor rate assessment and not the sanitary rate, which was liable to deductions. But there was a small difference. Under the Amendments of his hon. friends, the incidence of the rate would not be the incidence which rested upon the county rate basis. The effect of the Amendment of his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education would be this—in a County Council area the cost of education would be defrayed out of the general rate levied over the whole area having for its basis the county rate basis, and in the case of a borough the poor rate basis or the borough rate basis. Difficulties in connection with assessment did not arise in borough areas as they did in county areas. In the county areas they had to deal with inequalities between different unions; whereas there was not the same conflict in the case of a borough area except in very rare instances, though it did arise in most cases where there was more than one union in the area, but in a mitigated form. There it was met by the power possessed by the Borough Council to have its own assessment, if not satisfied with the union assessment. There remained only the urban sanitary districts to be dealt with. In these districts there was no rate similar to the borough rate or the county rate; there was only the sanitary rate, which would not do. Therefore they proposed to take the ordinary poor rate assessment; the only detail worthy of mention being that in the rather limited number of cases where the sanitary district was divided into parishes, the assessment as between the parishes would be on the poor rate basis and not on the borough rate or county rate basis. He hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment of his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education as dealing more completely with the matter.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said that agricultural land which was only assessed at half the poor rate would not come under the Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education.

MR. WALTER LONG said that that would not in any way affect his hon. friend's Amendment.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley) said he wished to express his very great satisfaction at the explanation given by his right hon. friend, and the promise he had made on behalf of the Government. The fact was that when the Clause was drafted a very serious and inexcusable mistake was made. Under the Clause as it stood, manufactories and householders would have to pay a very much larger proportion of the rate than the owners of land, railway companies, docks and canals. Allusion had been made to Romford, but many other constituencies were similarly situated. In his own constituency, there were three railways covering a large acreage, and there were also canals, which would escape their fair proportion if the Clause remained as it was. They would only have to contribute 3d. in the £, whereas householders would have to contribute 1s. in the £. Therefore, he regarded the Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education, which had been explained so clearly by his right hon. friend, as a measure of justice; and he hoped it would meet with the entire approval of the Committee.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he had not the least objection to the withdrawal of the Amendment, and the substitution of the Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education. He agreed with what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman in support of the Amendment. The doctrines on which the hon. Member based the Amendment before the Committee were applicable to various parts of the country, and were not confined to the case of Essex. He submitted that it would not be in order to follow the line of argument raised by the hon. Member opposite on the Government Amendment, though he hoped they would have an opportunity of raising the question they wished to raise on (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*).

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he did not see much advantage in prolonging the present discussion. He merely wished to say on behalf of the urban district of Kettering and many similar districts that the proposals of the Government were perfectly satisfactory to those authorities, and wished to thank the Government for the Amendment they had wisely placed on the Paper.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said in withdrawing his Amendment he wished to thank the Government for the Amendment they had put down. At the same time, he should say that an immense amount of ill-feeling and a sense of injustice had been created, because the Amendment had not been thought of before.

*MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) said the Government now proposed that the expenses of the Education Act should be paid out of the poor rate instead of the county fund or the borough rate. Did the Government, in making this change, propose to deal with the great inequalities of assessment to the poor rate? Some District Councils and Corporations assessed on one system, and some on another. In rural districts rent was taken as the basis of assessment in one union, and estimates of annual value in the other. He thought there ought to be uniformity in the system of assessment.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he doubted whether it would be possible within the scope of the present Bill to deal with the large and complicated question which had just been mentioned by his hon. friend. There was an announcement in the King's Speech that legislation on the subject was contemplated, but it was not introduced.

MR. WALTER LONG said that that was quite true. One of the great difficulties of the local taxation question was valuation and assessment, and until they had dealt with valuation and assessment they could not approach the local taxation question with any degree of satisfaction or hope of a final settlement. As the noble Lord, however, knew, time did not permit of the introduction of many measures, and that referred to was one of them.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(4.30.) SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said the object of his Amendment was to meet certain exceptional cases which had not been provided for in the Bill. It was well known that by Act of Parliament no borough rate could be levied unless the borough fund was insufficient. He, however, understood that the President of the Local Government Board was prepared to accept the Amendment, therefore he would say no more about it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 24, after the word 'rate,' to insert the words 'or a separate rate to be made, assessed, and levied in like manner as the borough rate.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'or' to insert the words 'if no borough rate is levied.'"—(*Mr. Fison.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. WALTER LONG said the point raised undoubtedly required attention. There were cases where the borough fund had proved sufficient hitherto for all local purposes, yet where it might become exhausted unless sufficient provision were made. As the tendency of modern legislation was in the direction of consolidation, and not of separation, he would accept the Amendment as amended by his hon. friend, which would limit its application to those cases where a separate rate had not been issued up to the commencement of this Act.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 25, after the word 'district' to insert the words 'other than a borough.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Amendment agreed to.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said after the clear explanation given by his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade the Amendment he now rose to move would need very little explanation from him. The Amendment was an important one. Its object was to provide that the education expenses of an urban district should not be raised out of the district rate, but out of the poor rate, in order to avoid the exceptions to which the urban district rate was liable.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, lines 25 and 26, to leave out the words 'as expenses incurred for the general purposes of the Public Health Acts,' and insert the words 'in manner provided by Section 33 of the Elementary Education Act, 1876, as respects the expenses in that Section.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. BRYCE drew attention to the fact that in this case the right hon. Gentleman opposite had adopted the objectionable practice of legislation by reference, which could, he submitted, in this case have easily been avoided. The lines of the Section of the Act of 1876 which it was proposed to incorporate were only six or seven, and it would have been much more convenient to the bodies who would have to administer the Bill if he had incorporated those lines bodily rather than to refer them to a separate Act.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that he was in general agreement with the observations made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, but he submitted that this was a case where the course taken was a desirable one, as it thus made it clear that the expenses were to be raised in the same way as under the Act of 1876.

MR. BRYCE thought the Attorney General's remarks had not answered the objection.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) asked if there was any necessity for the words at the end. He had no legal knowledge with regard to it, but was it not possible that, if those words were left in, they might be considered as relating only to the expenses referred to in that particular section.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS thought that this was essentially a case where legislation by reference ought not to have been resorted to. It would have been a very simple thing to have incorporated the words referred to in the new Act. The only justification for legislating by reference was the undesirability of overloading an Act with unnecessary words. That was not the case here.

MR. WALTER LONG admitted there was much in the contention of the hon. and learned Member who had just spoken, but at the same time pointed out that the Amendment had been considered carefully by those responsible, who considered this was the most convenient form in which to move it. He had, however, taken notice of what had been said, and would consider whether it would not be advisable to alter the form at another stage of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. CHANNING said the Amendment he now moved had been pressed upon him by urban districts whose councils were autonomous authorities for the purposes of Part III., and who also had power to raise a penny rate for education other than elementary under Section 3. Some of these districts had the strongest desire to carry out a bold policy of providing for secondary education, and were willing to exercise all their powers and make all possible sacrifices for this object. But it was urged on behalf of the ratepayers that where they had paid a local rate under Section 3 the rating power of the County Council should be exercised in the district only to supplement and expand the secondary education within such a district itself, and that the district should not be called upon to contribute also to the general expenses of secondary education throughout the county.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 26, at end, to insert the words, '(*a*) The County Council shall not raise any sum on account of their expenses under Part II. of this Act within any urban district the council of which is an education authority for the purposes of Part III. of this Act, and which has levied a rate under Section 3 of this Act for the purposes of education other than elementary, save and so far as the proceeds of any such county rate may be applied for the supply or aid of education other than elementary within such urban district; and (*b*).'"—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WALTER LONG pointed out that the Amendment, if accepted, would lead to an anomalous condition of things, because, while it would exempt Urban District Councils, the Borough Councils would be left untouched. The issue, however, was a very simple one. The principle of the Bill was that there should be concurrent powers in the councils of boroughs of 10,000 population and urban districts of 20,000 and the County Councils. But the intention of the Government had been that while those concurrent powers should be preserved, every inducement should be given to the County Councils, not only to exercise, but to exercise fully, their concurrent power, the aim being that the County Councils should be the main directing and controlling authority, while the local authority should have power, if they wished, to give special or extra aid to the development of education in their own area. Under these circumstances the Government could not accept an Amendment which would deprive County Councils of the means of doing that which it was hoped they would do.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE agreed that the Amendment would strike a heavy blow at the idea of making the County Council the local education authority. It was true that he supported an Amendment to give certain large powers to the smaller boroughs, but the idea of those who supported the proposal was that of not depriving the small places of the powers they possessed, and at the same time encouraging them to exercise them in a subordinate capacity. The present Amendment would go a great deal further, and practically place the small authorities in a position of much greater independence, and reduce the

County Councils to the position of subordinate authorities. He did not think that was a proper thing to do, and he hoped his hon. friend would not press the Amendment.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) asked what would be the position of a borough like that of Neath, which, under Clause 3, had power to levy a rate of 1d. in the £ for the purposes of Part II of the Bill. Could the County Council of Glamorgan levy a rate of 2d. for similar purposes in the area of the borough of Neath, and the municipal corporation of Neath levy another rate of 1d?

MR. WALTER LONG: Yes.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said that in that case, if the borough of Neath raised a penny rate to develop the secondary schools within its area, they would have only a very moderate control over the action of the County Council in regard to the twopenny rate. He thought that was hardly a sound position in which to leave these matters.

MR. WALTER LONG pointed out that that was the law at present; it was not a change made by this Bill. The powers in regard to secondary education were concurrent in the County Council and the municipal authority.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said the case to which he referred was one in which there was already a rating power vested in the County Council for the purposes of secondary education quite apart from the Technical Instruction Act. In Neath they had a county school, and the borough contributed its share of the halfpenny rate under the Act of 1889. Was it a statesmanlike proposition to introduce this kind of divergence between the people who happened to live in Neath and those in, say, Briton Ferry, two places between which there was hardly any distinction to be drawn, but the latter of which did not come under Clause 3 of the Bill?

MR. WALTER LONG said that no doubt distinctions would arise as between localities which in themselves were very similar, but that question was fully debated at an earlier stage of the proceedings on the Bill. These authorities and areas possessing certain powers were in existence in many cases, and in any reform it had always been found impossible to ignore them, no matter from which Party in the House the reform proceeded. In this particular case he did not think Neath was in reality a sufferer. In one respect it was better off than the remainder of the district, because, although it might pay more for it, it had the power to spend money in its own interest and according to its own inclination.

MR. CHANNING recognised that, after the reply of the right hon. Gentleman, it would be useless to press the Amendment. His intention, however, was not in any way to interfere with the method of control or the co-ordinating power of the County Council as regarded the general work of education, but simply to make an adjustment of the incidence of rating as between one district and another.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The next Amendment, standing in the name of the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, was as follows:—

"In Clause 13, page 5, line 26, at end, to insert '(*a*) the Council shall make an estimate of the amount of their expenses under this Act, and exemptions under The Agricultural Rates Act, The Tithe Rent-Charge (Rates) Act, 1899, and paragraph (*b*) of sub-Section one of Section two hundred and eleven of The Public Health Act, 1875, shall not apply to so much of any rate as is required to raise that amount.'"

*THE CHAIRMAN: Of the next Amendment only the first line and part of the second line are in order. The portion providing that certain exemptions should not apply is not in order.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): May I ask why?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is an Amendment of the Rating Act.

MR. TREVELYAN: May I read Clause 1 of the Rating Act?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is no use reading that. I have already given a similar ruling once or twice in the course of these debates. On June 30th there were two Amendments to exactly the same effect, and I ruled them both out of order on the ground that they were Amendments, in the one case, to the Agricultural Rates Act, and in the other to the Tithe Rent-Charge Act.

MR TREVELYAN pointed out that the Agricultural Rates Act provided that "the occupier of agricultural land should be liable in the case of every rate to which this Act applies." As under the present Bill a new rate was being levied, he submitted that they had the power of saying whether the Act applied or not.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is not a new rate, it is an increase of the existing rate. That is not in order. The next Amendment of the hon. Member is in order.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the local authority ought to be called upon to give an estimate of their expenses. Unless some Amendment was inserted, it would be absolutely impossible to know how the Act was working. If hon. Members opposite had confidence in the Act, it was to their interests that they should know what the schools were costing. There was at present an annual return made to the Board of Education, and it was published; consequently they could easily find out what the schools were costing. They had also a system of voluntary subscriptions, but once they got the two systems mixed up it would be impossible to distinguish, except by very minute examination between the two. Consequently the advocates of the system would cast the blame for any increase in the cost of education upon the other. What possible objection could the Government have to making a clear and distinct estimate of what the expenses really were? That was all they wanted. He begged to move the Amendment standing in the name of his hon. friend the Member for the Elland Division.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 26, at end, to insert the words '(*a*) the Council shall make an estimate of the amount of their expenses under this Act.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

(5.5.) LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said he thought it was the legal duty of the Council to present an estimate of their expenditure.

MR. WALTER LONG asked the Committee, in the absence of any definite assurance to the contrary, not to draw a distinction between the work of education and the other work of the county.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked would it be necessary in the accounts to distinguish between the provided and the non-provided schools.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am afraid I can hardly answer a conundrum of that kind. I should imagine that the estimate would have to be a complete one, and as the expenditure would vary, I should think that any budget to be complete must distinguish between the two. I should have thought it would have been better to leave this to the general interpretation of the law rather than introduce an Amendment here.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said it was essential that they should know how much money was provided by the Education Department for the two purposes, which were distinct, because the management of one set of schools was in one hand and the other set in another. It was essential that they should ask the Government to impose the duty of showing the expenditure required for the existing voluntary schools and unprovided schools and also for the provided schools, otherwise the country would be quite in the dark as to how much the voluntary system cost to carry out. It would be necessary to see how the bargain now described as equitable would work out when it came to be tested by the actual facts. There was another matter which he desired to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to in regard to the Amendment. They knew that under the present law the portion of the rate which was raised for School Board purposes was separately put upon the demand note. He wished to know whether the demand note in the future would distinguish as to how much was required for education. He should like, it if possible, to distinguish between the two classes of schools.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that at the beginning of April in each year the County Council had to present a budget. In his county this budget was set out in very great detail. They knew exactly the amount they were going to spend for roads managed by themselves and for roads managed for them; and in education it would be of the greatest possible interest to know how much they were going to spend on board schools and how much on voluntary schools. At the end of the year it was quite certain they had to produce, their accounts for public inspection and he could not imagine why they should do otherwise. This was in everybody's interest. He thought the Amendment was entirely unnecessary.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he wished to know exactly if in the Local Government Act of 1888 there was any absolute obligation placed upon the Council to make an estimate of the amount of their expenses under the Act.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): It is imposed upon the Finance Committee.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he had looked through the Act, and he did not find that any proper statutory direction had been given by Parliament in the matter. After the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carnarvon he wished to add the words, "distinguishing the amount to be expended upon schools provided and schools not provided by the local education authority."

Amendment proposed to the Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'distinguishing the amount to be expended upon schools provided and schools not provided by the local education authority.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said that there was possibly a direction in the Act which compelled the Council to prepare a budget. There were some Clauses which provided for special duties larger than those which existed under the Municipal Corporations Act upon the Finance Committee in all these matters. Therefore he did not think there was any doubt that under the Local Government Act there was a clear duty on the part of the County Council to prepare a budget and proper estimates. The County Council would, no doubt, pursue the same course in the future, but there could be no objection to the insertion of these words. They were all agreed that it was right and necessary that the expenditure of the provided and the non-provided schools should be carefully distinguished. Although he did not think it was necessary to insert the words, it might be that they would conduce to the clearness of the Clause, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the matter.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said that the words were obviously unnecessary. Under Section 74 of the Act of 1888, the County Council were bound to prepare an estimate of the expenditure for the year. Unnecessary words in any Act of Parliament were objectionable, because they gave rise to confusion. As regarded the necessity of distinguishing between the expenses caused by provided and non-provided schools, he thought they would be drafting the Act in a loose and objectionable way if they drew special attention to that and left out other items of expenditure equally important.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the whole point of this discussion lay in the Amendment to the Amendment. It was moved on the grounds admirably stated by the hon. Member for Carnarvon. With regard to the suggestion of his noble friend the Member for the Cricklade Division, he maintained that the estimate was an entirely different thing from the audit. The question dealt with in the Amendment was not covered by the audit at all. He thought the Amendment as amended by his hon. friend was one on which the sense of the Committee ought to be taken.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said it would be perfectly easy to separate the estimates for the two classes of schools. It would be satisfactory to know what additional expense was incurred by the new schools. He had in his possession estimates of what would be the expenditure on the voluntary schools in his district. He did not think there would be the slightest difficulty in carrying out what was proposed, and, therefore, the Amendment to the Amendment should be inserted.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said the object of the Amendment would not be fully attained unless the estimate was not only made but published. He did not know whether or not there would be a legal obligation to publish it, but, at any rate, he supposed that any member of the County Council would be able to insist that there should be publication. It was very important that the people who paid the county rate should know how it was applied. He did not know whether on the demand note the two classes of schools could be distinguished, but, if practicable, it was desirable that the amount for each should be specified.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said the Act of 1888, to which the hon. Member for East Somerset had referred, did not apply to this particular case. He hoped the cost of the two classes of schools would be estimated separately, and that duty should be provided for in the Bill.

Mr. WALTER LONG said an appeal had been made to the Government to accept the words of the Amendment because there might be some doubt about the Clause, or because they would make it clearer, or do no harm. He agreed with his hon. friend the Member for the Tewkesbury Division that, unless it could be clearly shown that the words in Section 74 of the 1888 Act were not sufficient for the purpose, it was undesirable and wrong to put in words simply because they might explain something to somebody which that somebody might not otherwise know. The 1888 Act was perfectly clear so far as estimates were concerned, and, therefore, the existing law was sufficient. The question raised by the hon. Member for North Monmouthshire as to the character of the demand note was a somewhat different one. It would not be possible to enforce conditions in regard to the character of the demand note by the Amendment under consideration. All the Committee had now to consider was whether, having various duties to perform and large expenses to incur, the County Council should, in respect of one particular detail of expenditure, have laid on them a separate duty which was not laid upon them with regard to the whole of the rest of their financial duties.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was true that by the Act of 1888 the County Council was bound to prepare an estimate of the expenditure for the year, but they were not bound to distinguish between provided and non-provided schools. In the preparation of their budget all they would have to say would be that the estimate, in respect of education for the county was say £5,000, and once they had done that they would have exhausted their function under the Section, but they were not bound to say that £10,000 would be for voluntary schools and £5,000 for provided schools. They wanted to know what these two separate systems were to cost. He thought it rather significant that the Government were not prepared to accept an Amendment that would allow the ratepayers to get at the secret of what they were paying in respect of particular schools.

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment," put, and agreed to.

(5.28.) Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 127; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 504.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P, (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Roland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard

Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Brynmor Jones and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Gray, Ernest, (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W. (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John, (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn, Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, Rt. Hon James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W J H. (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Col. C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

(5.40.) MR. TREVELYAN said that the omission of sub-Section (*a*) of this Clause, which he proposed to move, raised a very important point in rating. He thought that the fact that the hon. Member for East Somerset had got an Amendment on the Paper which would partly effect what he proposed to do, was sufficient evidence of its importance. The sub-Section permitted the County Council to saddle different parts of the county with separate charges for technical and secondary education, but the effect of his proposal to omit the sub-Section would be that all the expenses of higher education in the county would fall on the county rate. Many hon. Members had a great deal in common with part of the speech of the hon. Member for Stretford when that hon. Gentleman said that they could not have anything more unfair than putting a national service on a small locality. What they expected from this Bill was that the County Councils and the local authorities were to be actuated by a large and energetic policy in providing secondary education throughout the county. He thought that they ought to do everything they could to induce the County Councils to adopt not merely a sectional scheme of building schools and providing secondary education, but so to lay out the counties educationally as to have them available to everyone—that was to say, to afford the same opportunity to everyone in the county to obtain the same quality of teaching. As things stood at present, secondary schools were scattered over the different counties under no system, as the result of private enterprise or the historical chance of the pious founder. What was wanted was a regular system by which secondary education of an advanced kind should be available for every child in all parts of the county. He was afraid that the Government proposal to allow the county authority to put the rate for secondary education, if they pleased, upon the special localities which would be served by the secondary schools, was likely to perpetuate a sectional and parochial way of dealing with secondary education in the different counties. Every poor district would naturally resist having a secondary school if the policy was adopted of making the locality pay for the secondary rate. What was likely to happen in many counties was something of this kind; supposing a large part of the county was agricultural, and the other part urban, in the urban districts there would be a keenness about technical and secondary education; whereas in the agricultural districts there would be no enthusiasm at all. It was clear that, if the latitude at present given in the Bill was retained, it would be extremely likely that the policy that the County Council would adopt would be to let the urban districts rate themselves for secondary education, leaving the agricultural districts without any secondary schools at all. He wished to ask whether that was the policy which the Committee had in its mind in connection with the Bill. He did not think it was. He thought the policy enunciated by the Government was the systematic provision of secondary schools throughout the country, and he was afraid that the proposal of the Government would be to induce counties to adopt a sectional system where there was little enthusiasm about secondary education, with the result that large parts of the country would be left without any secondary education at all. There was a practical difficulty of a rather serious kind which applied equally to the proposal of the Government and to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset. It was very easy to lay down what the boundaries of a district should be for the purposes of elementary education, as schools would have to be provided everywhere for all children, but in the case of secondary education, where there was no compulsion, the area from which any secondary school would draw the children attending it would vary very much with its excellence. If at one period the master of the school was a bad master, it would be extremely likely that that school would only draw the children from its immediate neighbourhood, but if a better master were appointed the school would immediately begin to supply instruction to a much wider area. A very difficult practical problem would face any County Council that tried to put into operation any such Clause as was now proposed, from the very fact that it would not be able to limit the sphere of any particular school. Therefore, because it was a difficult proposal to work, and, above all, because it dictated the wrong policy to the County Councils, who ought to have a general policy for secondary education, and ought not to have the option of leaving any part of the county out of the scheme, he hoped the sub-Section would be dropped.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, to leave out sub-Section (*a*)."—(*Mr Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (*a*) stand part of the Clause."

MR. WALTER LONG said that the Government, in inserting the sub-Section, were animated by precisely the same reasons which had been given by the right hon. Gentleman as a justification for his Amendment. The hon. Gentleman said that the sub-Section would limit the power of the new local authorities in regard to secondary education and that it would retard their efforts in the right direction. He could not agree with the hon. Gentleman. There were a great many counties in Great Britain in which the population, conditions of life, and general circumstances varied enormously as between different parts of each county. The hon. Gentleman could not have had a very great experience of

County Council administration if he did not know that one of the greatest difficulties which County Councillors who favoured a progressive policy would have to meet would be the difficulty of those who would participate very slightly in the advantages of the new institutions, and who would be constantly urging that they ought not to be calledupon to pay for them. The hon. Gentleman appeared to think that the sub-Section imposed an absolute duty on the County Councils, whereas all it did was to give the County Councils, if they thought fit, in the interests of higher education, power to establish particular schools in particular areas, charging those areas for them. It would not prevent or interfere with the adoption of a general policy applicable to the whole county where that was thought desirable, and it did not prevent the adoption of a policy applicable to two-thirds of the county and another policy applicable to the remaining third. It should be remembered that, although a school was specially charged on the part of a county, there was nothing in the sub-Section to prevent what the hon. Gentleman desired, namely, the right of an individual pupil to attend a particular school which he or his parents thought more suitable. He believed that the sub-Section was a most valuable extension of the County Councils; that it would strengthen and not weaken their hands, and enable them, in certain circumstances, where they thought it desirable, to rate a special area for a particular school; whereas, if they did not think it desirable the Act would enable them to adopt the other alternative. He thought that was a power which the County Council would find useful in certain cases, and the Government thought it desirable to leave to the County Council discretion as to which of the two alternatives they should adopt.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the right hon. Gentleman had confined himself strictly to looking at localisation as it was effected by sub-Section (*a*); but it ran through the whole Clause. The sub-Section raised the general principle as to whether they ought to look at the matter as a county matter or whether they ought to have different rates for different parts of the county, each part of the county being charged in accordance with the benefits it formerly, but no longer, received.

MR. WALTER LONG said there was a very wide distinction between sub-Section (*a*) and sub-Sections (*c*) and (*d*). Sub-Section (*a*) dealt with future administration, whereas the other sub-Sections dealt with the existing condition of things.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the sub-Sections dealt partly with both. What he wished to point out was that sub-Section (*a*) was the first sub-Section which raised the question of treating different parts of a county differently. A great many hon. Members objected to the larger areas, and would have preferred smaller areas; but that was now past; and, looking at the Bill as it stood, many hon. Members thought that there ought to be a uniform charge over the whole county. If the sub-Section were to pass, he thought it would require some Amendment; and he would propose to put in words of limitation after the word "fit," because otherwise the sub-Section might be worked in such a way as to create great injustice without anything being known about it. They had no fixed principle up to the present time in regard to the areas for either elementary or secondary education. They varied in size in an almost incredible manner without any reason. It was a mere accident under the Act of 1870 that the areas were enormous in some places and quite small in others. In the present Bill, he thought they ought to look at the general interests of the county as a whole, and treat the charge as a county charge; and with that view strike out sub-Sections (*a*) (*c*) and (*d*) which were inconsistent with that principle.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade stated that the Government put down the Clause with the same object his hon. friend had, namely, to encourage secondary education. But he was afraid that there was a great deal of truth in what the right hon. Gentleman said—that a great many County Councils would be by no means anxious to carry out the Act in its entirety.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not state that.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he understood that the argument of the right hon. Gentleman was that some of the County Councils would be by no means anxious to carry out the Act.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that what he stated was that many County Councillors anxious to adopt a progressive policy would find a great difficulty in connection with districts which would derive no benefit from that policy, and would object to pay for it. In such cases, the County Council would be able to localise the expenditure, and the hon. Gentleman knew that that was frequently done.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that if the proposal were carried out, the consent of the locality would be required for the extra rate. What he feared from the proposal, if carried, was that it would lay down the principle, which would be acted upon by all County Councils, that there was to be an extra charge thrown on the locality. It was because he had this fear that he should vote for the Amendment. If these words were left in, there would be not only the objection of a particular County Council to the adoption of the first part of the Act, but there would be the additional opposition of a particular locality owing to this charge being thrown upon them.

(6.5.) Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he agreed, to a large extent, with what had fallen from the hon. Member for Poplar. He should be sorry to see anything done in the direction of encouraging County Councils to work the secondary part of this Act in a sectional manner. But this sub-Section was really a re-enactment of the existing law relating to technical instruction. The power had not been extensively used, but it had been used when rural distrits had come to the County Council and offered to contribute towards a technical school if the County Council would erect it in their district. He thought the hon. Member for Elland should not persist in his Amendment to strike out the sub-Clause altogether. It was most important that the area of higher education should be kept as wide and large as possible, and before the sub-Section was finally passed he should be glad to see some words inserted with that object.

Mr. EMMOTT said the real case against this sub-Section was that put forward by the right hon. Baronet—that the areas chosen by this Bill were by no means the best that might have been chosen for the purposes of education. Some were too large and some were too small. The effect of the words in the Bill was to make a strong and distinct suggestion to the local education authority that they should differentiate in regard to the expenses of their secondary schools. In the Welsh Act, as to the working of which a good deal had been said, there was no provision of this kind, nor was any differentiation made in any particular. It seemed to him quite impossible to decide on what parishes the expenses should be charged, because, when a new school was built, the scholars attending it would come from various districts. Oldham, for instance, drew the scholars for its technical school from four counties, and how in a case of that kind was it possible to say from where the scholars would come, and what would be the expense to be charged? In his opinion the tendency of this sub-Clause would be to encourage local squabbles, and infinitely less harm would be done by leaving it out altogether. He should therefore support the Amendment.

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he was strongly in favour of the Clause, which was a facilitating Clause of the greatest value. When they came to deal with such a condition of things as they found in Yorkshire, where on the one hand there was a great manufacturing district in the South and on the other there was one of our most valuable agricultural districts in the North, he did not think justice would be done to the latter unless something was done upon the lines of this sub-Section. There was the greatest difficulty at the present time in obtaining any outlay of money in remote parts where such an outlay was urgently required, and he felt sure that a provision of this kind would be of the greatest service in such an instance as he had given.

*MR. BARRAN (Leeds, N.) said he supported this Amendment. It seemed to him the first part of the Bill in which they came into direct contact with the question of the foreign competition which they had to meet in regard to education. It seemed to him that already in the Bill they had taken too narrow a view of secondary education. He would be glad if they were to treat it more on a national ground, and if a larger proportion of the expense for our secondary education were to be defrayed by the nation, as was the case in many of the competing countries. He thought it would be very unfortunate if, instead of making it more a national question, they brought it down to be less than a county question. In Yorkshire, if they were to have effective secondary schools they must have them in the great centres, and it would be practically impossible to locate the cost of them on different districts. The scholars would not come only from one district, and they would not return from the school only to one district. It would be a great waste of money and of energy if secondary schools were established in small centres for narrow requirements. That would necessitate an unnecessary and wasteful number of schools. The difficulty of getting these schools provided would be aggravated if there was a fear that some particular district was going to be rated for a school from which it would not receive the whole benefit. It was to the advantage of the county, and also to the advantage of the country, that they should try to draw the scholars for these secondary schools from the whole of the elementary schools of the county, and that the effect should be felt by their distributing themselves over the whole county. It was always a difficulty in our great cities to get rid of the feeling of jealousy between ward and ward; and the same difficulty would be experienced in greater force in the counties if they had to face opposition not only from one district but many districts. By compelling the whole county to take a broad view of the matter, and to concentrate their schools in the most convenient localities, irrespective of the requirements and wishes of particular districts, they would best help in meeting that competition in secondary education which they in Yorkshire felt so strongly—the competition of other countries which had more of a national, and less of a local system of education than existed in England.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY, after congratulating the hon. Member on his maiden speech, pointed out that this was a purely permissive provision, to be used only in exceptional circumstances. In normal conditions, secondary education would be a county charge; but there might be special cases where without this power of differentiation the County Council would be prevented from supplying the special want of a particular locality. In some cases, a particular part of a county had a special want. Without such a power as was here proposed, the County Council might very well hesitate to provide for that special want, because it would involve throwing upon the rest of the county an expenditure by which it did not in any way benefit. This power, however, would prevent the infliction of any such injustice.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE admitted that in some cases it might be desirable there should be a power of differentiation, but he thought it ought to be confined to capital expenditure. Under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, a common rate was levied over the whole county for the maintenance of the schools. In that there was no power of discrimination, but there was a certain amount of discrimination allowed in regard to capital expenditure. Where a school had to be built the County Council called upon the locality to contribute something like one half of the expenditure. A secondary or technical school added to the status and position of the particular town, and even improved the value of property therein, and upon the principle of betterment the town ought to contribute a larger share of the capital expenditure than was placed on the county at large. The experience in Wales was that the scholars were not drawn even proportionately from the town in which the school was situated. Every inducement ought to be given to have a certain number of good schools in a district rather than a multiplication of small and bad ones, and the power of placing part of the capital expenditure on the town would work in that direction. Every county in Wales provided travelling scholarships, and it would be very unfair to cast upon the towns any portion of the maintenance, because, so far from getting any advantage, the burden of the cost of the travelling scholarships fell on each district equally, and there was a levelling up in those cases. If this power of levying special contributions was limited to capital expenditure, he thought it would meet the views of the majority of the Committee.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that in some counties such a power as was given under this sub-Section would be altogether unnecessary, but there were other counties in which it would be eminently useful. In his own county there were strictly defined districts, each containing a large town, and in that town there was provided an excellent secondary school, which was resorted to by the children of the parishes in that particular division. Grants were made by the County Council to the districts according to their requirements. There was a clear advantage in the possession of such a power, and he should vote for it.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment. He desired to associate himself with the Attorney General in congratulating the hon. Member for North Leeds on his maiden speech, and to express the hope, which he was sure was shared by all the Committee, that it was but the first of many admirable contributions to the debates of the House. As to the question before the Committee, he was not able to agree to some of the arguments which had been advanced. He knew from actual experience the excellent results which had been achieved in a backward county through the existence of this power of differentiation. After all, this power was only the continuation of one that already existed. The hon. Member for North Wiltshire had recently stated that he was in the proud position of representing the only Parliamentary Division in England which was rated right through for the purposes of technical and secondary education. That had been done under the powers of the Technical Instruction Act. By an arrangement between the Wiltshire County Council and all the Urban and Rural District Councils, a county rate was levied with the consent of all concerned, and as a result they had succeeded in building a set of very good secondary and technical schools, covering the whole of the district. Without this power those schools would not have been in existence. They had not, however, levied the rate for ordinary annual maintenance, but to cover expenditure on buildings, and expensive apparatus for physical and chemical laboratories, and matters of that sort. That being so, he hoped the Committee would succeed in coming to an agreement on the point, and that the Government would agree to an Amendment limiting this provision to capital expenditure. It would be a very great mistake to enable a differential rate to be levied for that purpose. He might remind the Committee that under the Act of 1891, in regard to main roads it was agreed to distribute expenditure in certain proportions amongst all the Councils concerned when it was necessary to undertake any extensive work.

(6.30.) Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said this was not in any sense a Party question, and the line laid down by his noble friend who had just spoken and the right hon. Member for East Somerset was one which the Committee would be wise in adopting. It had been assumed that differentiation could only take place by means of rating, but it was possible to give considerable compensation to the rural districts by giving, as was done in a large number of cases, bursaries and scholarships, and paying the cost of the travelling of the scholars to the towns where the schools existed. The system of giving help by way of capital expenditure to the towns which worked the school had proved an admirable one, but it would only increase the complexity of county accounts if the principle put forward by the Government were adopted in this case.

Sir JOHN DORINGTON said he did not see why County Councils should be deprived of the liberty which he thought might sometimes be usefully exercised. Generally, he thought, the special rate should be limited to capital expenditure, but there might be circumstances in which it might be very desirable that the county, as a whole, should not be so charged. They might leave that to the County Councils in their discretion. He strongly advocated the greatest possible liberty in regard to this matter. He knew a case in which, if they had had the power under the Technical Education Act to raise a special rate, they would have founded a very desirable school to the great satisfaction of the locality. He said "Why did you not levy your own rate?" and they replied "We dare not do it, but you can." He said "Yes, you ask me to levy a rate on the whole county for your benefit. If I could levy a special rate for your district, I should be willing to do so." They were afraid of their own ratepayers in their own special district, and suggested that if he had power he should levy a special rate for them. Whether in that case maintenance would be provided as well would be a matter of consideration.

MR. TREVELYAN asked whether the Government would assent to the insertion of words limiting the power of differentiation to capital expenditure.

MR. WALTER LONG: No.

MR. WHARTON said he wished to suggest what might possibly be the result of this proposal. Suppose they had a very excellent school with good appliances, and the principal object was to encourage the study of engineering, and this school involved a large expenditure of capital. If the maintenance of that school was to be distributed over the whole county, would it not be rather hard that a school instituted for the benefit of one corner of the county should be paid for by the whole county? The result of this proposal would be that many very excellent schools would not be maintained. In the county of Northumberland four-fifths of the county was devoted to agriculture, and the other one-fifth constituted a very wealthy mining district. Was it suggested that the other four-fifths of the county of Northumberland should be mulcted to keep up an excellent technical school for the benefit of the rich mining centre which existed in the other one-fifth of the county? He hoped the Committee would trust the County Councils in this matter.

MR. BRYCE said the answer to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman opposite was that these schools were for the benefit of the whole county, and not simply for the mining part. The students would resort to those schools from all parts of the county. If the right hon. Gentleman would only read the Report of the Commission on Secondary Education he would see that one of the things which they considered was most needed in the English counties was the establishment of central schools for the whole county, and if such schools were properly organised and placed, they would be very valuable indeed to every part of the county. It was clear that, as the county as a whole would derive the benefit, the county ought to pay. He thought the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for East Somerset rested upon a sound foundation.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said that in Northumberland the agricultural class were the very people who would be most likely to use the schools founded by the County Council. Furthermore, the distinction between the poor four-fifths and the rich one-fifth was really a good instance of the way in which the wealthy portions of the county would be able to help the poor portion. There was very little reason to suppose that in the wealthy portion of the county the schools would be devoted to mining only, for no doubt many other subjects would be taught. The boys and girls who used the technical and secondary schools would be drawn from all over the counties, and it was impossible to cut up the counties of England into separate industries as would be necessary under this Clause. His hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs said he thought the reason why they ought to suppress their opinions upon this question was that the majority of the Committee were against them.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, no; I never said that.

MR. RUNCIMAN said that all the Commissions which had sat upon this question had urged that education was a national and not a parochial interest, and he heartily endorsed the speech made by his hon. friend the Member for North Leeds. He hoped the Government would see their way to accept the modifications suggested by the right hon. Member for East Somerset and limit this proposal to capital expenditure only.

Question put and agreed to.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE, in moving the next Amendment, said the danger of sub-Section (*a*) as it stood was that considerable injustice might be done under it without the knowledge of the locality. He thought what was being done should be in the knowledge of the locality.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 27, after the word 'fit,' to insert the words 'subject to notice to the minor local authority."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WALTER LONG said the words proposed by the right hon. Baronet might have a more extended meaning than appeared on the face of them. He would consider between now and the Report Stage whether the words should be introduced.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BRYCE said he desired to move the Amendment which stood on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Member for East Somersetshire, who did not intended to propose it himself. Many hon. Members thought when they saw it on the Paper that it was an excellent Amendment. It was to insert in page 5, line 29, after "elementary," the words "and in respect of capital expenditure." He thought it could be defended very clearly on the grounds indicated in the debate on the previous Amendment. There was a fast line between capital expenditure and maintenance expenditure. Where capital expenditure was for the erection of a school for the service of the place selected the charge should be borne by that place, but where a school was erected by the county authority to serve all parts of the county he thought the charge should be borne by the county as a whole.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 29, after the word 'elementary,' to insert the words 'and in respect of capital expenditure.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WALTER LONG said the objection the Government took to this Amendment was exactly the same as that which they took to the previous Amendment. They did not compel the County Council to exercise power in this direction. The sub-Section was not mandatory, but gave discretionary power to the County Council which they could exercise if they believed it would be in the interest of the education of the county. In the cases referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, where schools were provided for the benefit of the whole county, the County Council would undoubtedly, under the powers they had in the Act, be able to rate the whole area, but there might be cases in which schools of a special character were required in a particular part of the county for the advantage of the local industries, and if in such cases the whole area were rated either in respect of capital or maintenance expenditure there would be opposition raised to the scheme. The experience of his right hon. friend the Member for the Tewkesbury Division, who was Chairman of the Gloucestershire County Council, testified to the truth of what he was now saying. The Government could not assent to the Amendment.

(6.53.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 122; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 505).

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry

Mr. Runciman.

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Althur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn, Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)

Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, General Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he wished to move the omission of sub-Sections (*c*) and (*d*). He believed that some of his friends attached great importance to the excision of sub-Section (*c*), particularly on the ground that, in their opinion, it promoted the policy of denominational schools as against provided schools. He knew that Nonconformists entertained that feeling very strongly. His own ground for the excision of sub-Sections (*c*) and (*d*) was that which had been held against sub-Section (*a*). He objected very strongly to the localisation of rating parish by parish when the whole control had been given to the county authority. Under the scheme of the Clause they might have a rate of 1s. 4d in some parishes against 4d. in other parishes. Special provision was made by the House four years ago for the poorest or necessitous school districts, and that provision would be affected by this Clause in a curious way. The Act making the grants to the necessitous school districts would be virtually repealed by the Clause as proposed, and the result would be to leave a load of debt on these educational localities in the future. He maintained that there was no ground why these parishes should be punished for what was no fault of their own. Exceptionally hard cases would also arise under these sub-Sections. For instance, where two parishes had been linked together by the Board of Education for the purpose of forming a sufficiently large area for educational rating purposes, one of these parishes might be laid under a special charge while it received no benefit from it whatever. That was entirely contrary to the principle of the Bill; and the only way to get rid of this unequal treatment was by making a charge over the whole county instead of on parish by parish. The operation of sub-Sections (*c*) and (*d*) would, in many parishes be regarded as an injustice, and would add to the unpopularity of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 35, to leave out the words from the word 'part,' to the end of line 44."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and the County Council' stand part of the Clause."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was evident that the Government could not accept so very revolutionary a change as that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. What he wished was to throw upon the county at large all the cost now borne by special localities in respect to their board schools or in respect to schools which private liberality had given to the community. He could not believe that that would be a tolerable thing for a moment. The right hon. Gentleman argued that cases of injustice would happen in certain rural parishes. That might be, and on the face of it it might seem not very equitable, but that was not a system which would be encouraged by this Bill. On the contrary, the Bill provided that in the future the County Council was only to levy a special rate upon the district served by the school, and he thought that the particular cases of hardship to which the right hon. Gentleman referred should in no way prejudice the Committee against keeping these sub-Sections. The right hon. Gentleman had argued that the necessity of charging the major part of the cost upon the locality would prove a great discouragement to the locality in building schools; but if the sub-Section had any effect at all he thought it would have an effect precisely the other way. What he wished to say was that at the present time they could not really defend in the House the equity of distributing over the whole county, not only the maintenance charge, but the capital expenditure to which some districts were liable and others were not liable. With regard to School Board areas, at all events they would be benefited by the Bill. Their burdens were being lightened, and he thought that ought not to be accompanied by an immense imposition upon districts of the county which at present had no education rate to bear at all. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) opposed the retention of this sub-Section on grounds not precisely similar to those advanced by the right hon. Baronet. He opposed it for two reasons. In the first place he was convinced that the education of the country would be better forwarded by schools provided by the local authority than by denominational schools. In the second place, and this argument was equally strong, by imposing the cost of new schools on the parish itself, they directly discouraged the improvement of the educational equipment of the county. The great reason always put forward for establishing a voluntary school was that it would save a parochial rate, and if new buildings or efficient buildings were required in a particular district which the County Councils would be compelled to charge upon the rates, there would always be the greatest opposition to them.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said this was a sub-Section which could not be allowed to pass without further protest. It had to be read in conjunction with Clauses 9 and 10, which, according to the First Lord of the Treasury, had been put into the Bill to remove the Nonconformist grievance. No authority was likely to put Clauses 9 and 10 into force except under the most extraordinary conditions. It was obvious that the County Council would hestitate long before they decided to erect a new school in a parish, the whole burden of the cost of which was to be put upon the parish. Certain persons in the parish would at once take advantage of the appeal to the Education Department and ask them to consider the matter, and those in favour of opening a denominational school as a day school would receive the support of the Board. He further pointed out that by reducing the period for the repayment of loans the Bill made it more difficult for the County Council to impose on parishes the cost involved in the erection of new schools. He should support the Amendment.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS thought the sub-Section of such importance that it deserved far more consideration than it had received. If that consideration was given to it, the Committee would see how deeply this Clause cut into the very foundations of the system now being set up. A good deal had been heard as to whether it would not be better to leave this matter to the discretion of the County Councils, but now it was proposed to compel the County Councils to charge all the expense incurred by them both in providing new schools and in extending old schools to the particular parish. It was hardly necessary to argue in favour of the relief of small and needy parishes at the expense of the important commercial centres of the county. He failed to understand the distinction drawn by the Leader of the House between the equity of distributing the cost of maintenance over the whole county and that of distributing the capital expenditure over the whole county. In his opinion it would be far more equitable to put the maintenance on the particular parish rather than the capital charge. The practical effect on the education of a particular parish if this sub-Section was allowed to pass would be to raise the non-ratepaying people of the parish up in arms, and they would naturally say "We will put up with the schools we have rather than bear this charge."

It being half-past seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee,

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair].

Clause 13 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 35, to leave out the words from the word 'Part,' to the end of line 44."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question again proposed —

"That the words 'and the County Council' stand part of the Clause."

(9.3) Mr. SAMUEL EVANS in resuming said the original intention of the Government was to put the whole expenditure on the parishes, but, becoming frightened, they had introduced certain limitations. He objected to the Amendment in the interests of education, for he believed the Government were putting a premium on inefficient education and on denominational schools, because they were inviting the small parishes to object to the provision of new schools and the improvement of old schools. The result would be that there would be a great display of energy on the part of those who were in favour of a diminution in the rates of the locality, to prevent the County Councils substituting efficient for inefficient schools.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said no one would contend that the scheme of the sub-Section was perfect, and any scheme of this nature must always be open to criticism. He thought that the poorer parishes would suffer under this provision, and he certainly could not see why the poverty of a parish should not be taken into consideration by the Council. It was suggested that the sub-Clause would put a premium on denominational schools. This, in fact, seemed to be a Bill in which religion was cropping up from every quarter. If it were the object of the Clause to put that premium on denominational schools, he for one would not object. No one would suspect him of being a believer in the special doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, but he would rather see children educated in a Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, or Church school than in a board school. He had more regard to the effect and advantage of religious impressions made by those who had earnest convictions than he had for a religion founded on secular teaching. Therefore, he preferred denominational schools. If the Clause gave a preference to denominational schools, it certainly treated them all with equal fairness.

(9.13) Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 506.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gibbs, Hon A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus

Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Fenwick, Charles
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.

Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr Alfred Hutton.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said he moved the Amendment standing in his name in order to get an expression of opinion from the President of the Local Government Board.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words, 'subject to notice to the local education authority."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr WALTER LONG said the intention of the Amendment was that before certain action was taken by the authority notice should be given. As a matter of fact he did not think that it was possible to take action without notice and full explanation of what it intended to do. He would, however, deal with the matter on the Report stage.

Mr. BRYCE pointed out that the time for discussing these matters was very limited.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER: Will the right hon. Gentlemen himself put the necessary Amendment down?

Mr. WALTER LONG: If I think it necessary I will do so.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Then I ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(9.30.) Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said he begged to move to leave out "shall" in line 36, in order to insert "may, if they think fit." These were the words in sub-Section (*a*), and if there was to be unlimited discretion in relation to secondary education, why should there not be the same discretion with reference to elementary education? The Leader of the House stated that he objected to liabilities incurred in the past being saddled on the ratepayers, and to meet that objection he would be willing to limit his Amendment to the future. But as regarded the future, he considered that the discretion of the County Council should be unlimited, both on educational grounds, and also on grounds of fairness to poor parishes. He would take the case of two adjoining parishes, both equal in point of area, and both having the same educational needs and requirements. In one parish there might be important railway or other works, which would give it an enormous advantage. The other parish might have a small rateable value, 1d. in the £ producing perhaps only £10 or £20 a year. The County Council might be convinced that the poorer parish should have a provided school, but its rating liability might be as heavy as it could reasonably be called upon to bear. Why should not the County Council have full discretion in such a case to bear such portion of the capital expenditure as it thought fit. Therefore, on educational grounds he hoped the Amendment would be accepted. There was no question of principle as between the Prime Minister and himself, as the right hon. Gentleman had conceded the principle in the Amendment he had put down, and it was now only a question of amount. They should trust the local authorities. The natural jealousy of the ratepayers as a whole would prevent any injustice being done; and the County Council would exercise its power in such a way as to do justice to a poor parish and the educational needs of that parish.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 36, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the words 'may if they think fit.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis*).

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment. The hon. Gentleman said that there was no reason for any difference in the wording of sub-Section (*a*) and of sub-Section (*c*). He thought there was every reason for difference. Sub-Section (*a*) was intended to provide for strictly exceptional cases, where there were special circumstances and where it was necessary to have some branch of secondary education; and while the Government recognised that secondary education should be borne by a rate over the whole county, sub-Section (*a*) provided that a Council might, if they thought fit, charge the cost of a secondary school to the particular locality having the sole use to it. Sub-Section (*c*), on the other hand, dealt with the case of providing buildings for the purposes of elementary education; and they had to look at the existing state of things. There were a certain number of parishes where schools had been provided, and they were free of debt. (AN HON. MEMBER: "Not free of debt.") In a great many cases the schools were free of debt, and were provided by either private or public effort. These parishes were in a different position from parishes where no schools were provided, and should not be called upon to assume the burden of providing schools for other parishes after they had provided their own. There was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the First Lord of the Treasury which gave a certain discretion as to the amount which might be advanced. He thought it was reasonable; and anyone looking at the question all round must admit that the locality which had yet to provide its schools should bear a certain share of the burden, as otherwise a gross inequality would be established between localities who had schools and localities who had no schools. That would not be just; and he hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he fully admitted that the Amendment standing in the name of the Premier did not meet the case to a very considerable extent, but he thought it would be better if more discretion were given to the County Council. He did not think there was any real danger of the County Council abusing that discretion, because the instinct of the ratepayer would be to cast the whole of the burden on special localities, and the Council might depend on it that if the cost were distributed over the whole county it would be for very good reasons. He was passing through Glamorgan recently with a County Inspector, and he pointed out a parish in which the rates in one year went up to 3s. 6d. in the £. It seemed to him almost incredible. The reason, the Inspector said, was that there was no voluntary school, no squire living in the parish, no rich people, no works and no large farms. It contained poor, mountainous soil, and by the Education Act of 1870 the people in the parish were obliged to provide a school. As a result, the cost of education was kept down as much as possible, yet the provision of a small school, as cheaply as possible, raised the rates to 3s. 6d. in the £. He did not think that the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman would meet a case of that sort. A county like Glamorgan would very largely draw for the development of its resources on the very type of men brought up in little mountain parishes, and they made some of the best men in Cardiff, Swansea, and the Rhondda Valley. These men in the parishes like that mentioned were trained not for shepherds on the mountains but to develop the resources of the rich valleys in Glamorgan. If the poor parish he had mentioned went to the County Council of Glamorgan and said "Will you assist us to bear the burden of a little school—we could not help building it?" he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that the rich County Council of Glamorgan would reply "Certainly," and they would not consider whether they would give half or two-thirds, but would just ask what was fair. The real danger in giving discretion in a case of that kind was that pressure might be brought to bear; but those little poor parishes were just the parishes that could not bring pressure. They had only got the influence exerted by the development of their circumstances, and that was the influence which it was not fair for the House of Commons to resist. In a case like that quoted, why should a rich County Council like that of Glamorgan be prevented from taking all the circumstances into account and saying they would help the parish out of its difficulty? Why should they limit the discretion of the County Council?

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he hoped the Government would not accept the Amendment. He thought that many hon. Members felt that the proposal in the Amendment of the Prime Minister went as far as they ought to go with reference to the matter. The hon. Member who had just spoken said it would be very easy for a rich County Council to provide for special cases, but he would remind the hon. Gentleman that Cardiff, Swansea, and the other districts to which he referred, would be excluded from the administrative county which would have to bear the particular charge in the case he mentioned, and that charge would have to fall on poor districts which had already schools, and which would have to bear in consequence a heavier burden. [An Hon. Member: Not unless they wished.] They would have to bear an additional burden whether they wished it or not, because they would have to pay the county rate out of which the schools would be provided.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. Gentleman had misapprehended the Amendment. The Amendment was not to compel the County Council to assist to any extent; it was simply to give them discretion.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY said the Amendment would throw the option entirely the other way. Small districts which had provided their own schools should not have a rate imposed on them in connection with the capital expenditure for the provision of schools in other localities.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he thought the hon. Gentleman was not present when the Committee was discussing sub-Section (*a*). On that sub-Section the whole point of the Government's position was—and he thought there was a good deal of force in it—that the general system should be a county rate, but that there might be exceptional circumstances in regard to certain districts which would induce a County Council to throw some part of the cost on a particular locality. He could understand that position, but he could not understand the attitude of the Government in connection with sub-Section (*c*). Surely the same argument applied with equal and even greater force. All that was desired by the Amendment was to give the County Councils some latitude in particular cases. He agreed with the Attorney General that it would be hard to make one compulsory universal rate, which would fall on districts which had already provided their own schools, and which would be mulcted for places which had neglected their duty, but he hoped that Government would reconsider their decision and allow County Councils to have an option to deal with particular cases of hardship, which would be certain to arise.

Mr. Laurence Hardy.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER said that, like the Attorney General, he disliked gross inequalities, and if he were of opinion that the Amendment would produce them he would not support it. It was because he desired to leave it to the County Council to do away with gross inequalities that he supported the Amendment. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Burghs had mentioned the case of the mountain parish in Wales being compelled to provide a school. He knew another case where a parish was compelled to build a school at a time when there was ample employment for all the adult male population, but the employment disappeared, and now only a few farmers remained, who were in the direst trouble. He knew another case where a manufacturer built a village. There were no other houses in the village except workmen's cottages, and before the property qualification for Boards of Guardians was abolished there was not a man in the village qualified to be a Guardian. Employment in that neighbourhood had now greatly diminished, and the people were in dire trouble. In the adjoining parish, where well-to-do people lived, a school was erected by public subscription at no great sacrifice. There they had two adjoining parishes, one well-to-do, the other dull, with small cottages naked and in a row; and it was because he desired that the County Council should have the option of redressing such inequalities that he heartily supported the Amendment.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said both the Amendment and the Clause dealt with the capital charge for the provision of new schools. With reference to liabilities already incurred, he thought that a progressive, poverty-stricken parish which had provided itself with a school, ought to have its liabilities met out of the county rate. The liabilities ought to be pooled. He was alone in that. [Hon. Members: No, no.] He was glad to hear he was not; but that was not the issue now. The issue was, What was to be the incidence of the capital charge for the provision of new schools? He earnestly hoped it would be the county rather than the parish.

The Government believed that education should be in the main a national charge. Surely it was the county rather than the parish that should meet whatever charge would be put on the localities. The curse of the Act of 1870, which had made the present Bill possible to many, was that it took the parish as the unit of administration and financial obligation. He remembered the First Lord of the Treasury relating to the House how many poor parishes there were which had a rate of 30d. in the £ to meet its administrative machinery. The right hon. Gentleman was wrong as regarded the 30d., although the amount was large, but the Bill were to get rid of such difficulties, it was now for the Government to act. At present 25 per cent. of the English School Board parishes had a rate which ranged from 1s. to 3s. 6d. In Wales in 33 per cent. of the School Board parishes the rate ranged from 1s. to 3s. 6d. That was the result of taking the parish as the unit of financial administration. He (the hon. Member) would rather contrast parishes where a penny rate brought in only £2 10s. with others where it produced about £300. How could parishes where a penny rate brought in only £2 10s. resist the blandishments of any denomination who offered them a building at no charge? Such parishes would then be committed to a denominational school as long as this Act remained unrepealed. Surely the County Councils should have a discretion so that they might help these poverty-stricken districts. A stronger case could not be made out than that for the Amendment, and he hoped it would be agreed to.

(10.0.) MR. WALTER LONG said no one could deny the power and authority with which the hon. Member for North Camberwell spoke on these questions, but he thought the hon. Gentleman had, unintentionally no doubt, put the case in a false light. He had more than once said that education was a national object.

DR. MACNAMARA: I said "in the main."

MR. WALTER LONG: Very well, in the main. It was all very well for hon. Gentlemen opposite to attack the Government, and to describe its action in their own phraseology, and to talk about education being in the main a national object. What had been done by the different parties in the House towards making education a national object? So far as assistance to education from national funds was concerned, he thought the subventions had come almost entirely from one side of the House. The Government had given proof, not only in the present, but in the past, of their desire that the nation should bear a fair share of the cost of national education. But this was a totally different question, and had nothing to do with national education. It was a question as between different parishes in a county. The hon. Member had spoken of the poverty-stricken parish being called upon to provide a school, but he forgot the parish, equally poverty-stricken, which by great efforts and at great sacrifices had provided a school. Was such a parish to be rated in order to find schools for other parishes? Was not one side of the picture as much entitled to consideration as the other? The difficulty they were in in this matter was a difficulty they always encountered in approaching questions of local government; that was, that they could not approach the question as if there was no past history or previous action connected with it. Was there any detail in local government as to which they would not have taken a different course to that they had taken if they had been working on new ground altogether? They had to deal with things, not as they would like them to be, but as they found them. There were many places in the country in which remarkable efforts had been made to provide schools, and yet it was suggested that these places were to be rated to provide schools in places where no provision at all had been made locally. The proposal of the Bill, taking facts as they were, was the fairest that could be made, and he hoped the Committee would not adopt an Amendment which he believed would work great injustice.

MR. BRYCE desired to recall one great principle of the Bill. The Bill did not declare that education was a national charge, but it declared that it was a county charge; that was the basis of the whole Bill; that was to say, that the county was to bring up all its schools to the same level, and he contended that it was a great deviation from that principle to refuse to allow the County Council when it thought a case had been made out, to throw the cost of providing a particular school on the county. One of the great evils connected with education in rural districts was the defectiveness of the buildings; in many cases they were too small, in others insanitary. In nothing was the bringing in of the county likely to do more good than in the provision of better buildings. If, however, a poor parish was always to bear the charge of building a new school or enlarging its existing school, the representatives of the parish would go to the County Council and beg them not to insist on the expenditure because of the burden it would throw on the parish. It was really in the interests of efficient education that the County Councils should be allowed a discretion.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS pointed out that under the proposal of the Government the County Council, without exercising any discretion at all, was to make poor parishes, if they could, pay for all their future schools. The result would be that the small parishes would be either without improved or new schools or they would fall back on the old bad system of denominational education. The principle of the Amendment was the equalisation of the charge. The broader they made the field the easier would be the burden, and obviously the area of the county would make the burden easier than the area of the parish. The Amendment was really enforced in the strongest possible manner by a proposal which the Prime Minister had placed on the Paper. First of all it was intended that there should be no discretion whatever, but there was now to be a sort of truncated discretion. If an expenditure of £300 was proposed, according to the Prime Minister, the parish was to be made to pay not less than £150 or more than £225 of it. The discretion of the County Council, which had been so much preached on the other side, was to be measured by pounds, shillings and pence, and it was to be between the sums of £150 and £225. The Amendment placed no compulsion on the County Council; it simply enabled them so to provide that the richer parishes helped the poorer in the provision of new schools. There was really no difference between the Prime Minister and his hon. friend; the former proposed that certain things should be done if the County Council thought fit while the latter suggested that certain things might be done if the County Council thought fit. Sound sense was entirely in favour of the Amendment and he hoped it would be carried.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that if the word "shall" were read in conjunction with an Amendment shortly to be moved by the First Lord of the Treasury, it would be seen that the richest parishes would only have to pay three-fourths of the cost of building a school, the remaining fourth being paid by the poorer parishes. It was truly a case of "To them that hath shall be given."

(10.18.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 214; Noes, 100. (Division List, No. 507.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavious Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A G H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, William Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Lawrence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H. (Sheff'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling]
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphrey-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson F.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Lewis and
Dr. Macnamara.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name. This question has already been discussed, and in the present condition of the discussion of the Bill, I think I shall best serve the general interest if I move the Amendment without words.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'charge,' to insert the words 'such portion as they think fit, not being less than one-half or more than three-fourths of.' "—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

MR. BRYCE: I think the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment is better than nothing.

MR. RUNCIMAN moved to amend the proposed Amendment by leaving out the words "being less than one-half or."

Amendment to the Amendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

(10.35.) MR. HERBERT ROBERTS moved the omission of sub-Section (*d*). He said that he did so upon two main grounds. In the first place because he thought it ought to be omitted in fairness to the ratepayers, and in the second place because he thought it would be a good thing for education. If it was right in the case of the building of a new school that the County Council should provide half the cost, upon what ground could it be said that the same treatment should not be dealt out to existing schools. He could not see himself that there was the slightest difference between the two cases. He moved this Amendment also upon the general ground of equality of treatment. The First Lord of the Treasury, earlier in the proceedings, upon another Amendment, made a point of the fact that those chool Districts which had not had a School Board rate ought not to be penalised for having contributed to districts which had had a school board rate. The President of the Local Government Board more than once pointed out that it would be grossly unfair upon those districts which had avoided the rate that they should be penalised by having to contribute anything to the liabilities incurred by the poorer districts. But where did the sacrifice really lie? Was it not more true to say that those districts which had for the last twenty or twenty-five years paid the rate should receive more considerate treatment? The principle of this Amendment was the broad one of equal rating treatment throughout the county, and this equality of rating treatment could only, upon the whole, be secured by equal rating, and by enabling the local education authority to lay, as far as possible, equal rates upon every district in the county. There was only one further remark which he desired to make. He thought the Committee had not sufficiently realised that these School Board districts under this Bill would not be exactly in the same condition as they had been up to now. It was quite a different thing to ask any School Board district to continue to be liable for their debts when they had popularly elected managers, and to ask them to do so under the provisions of this Bill. All these considerations pointed to the fairness of treatment which would be established by his Amendment. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 41, to leave out sub-Section (*d*)."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the County Council shall' stand part of the Clause."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bill as it stands, and as it will be amended by a Government Amendment standing in the name of the Secretary to the Board of Education—I beg pardon, standing in my own name—will leave the charge exactly where it is at present, and that, broadly, may and will meet the equities of the case were it not that they handed over to the County Council all the money under the Act of 1897. If we handed over that money to the County Council for the general purposes of education, we think it only fair that, in return for that surrender, a certain proportion of the debt thrown on the locality should be borne by the general area over which the local education authority presided. That is the justification of the sub-Section as it will be amended, I hope, by my Amendment, and I hope that justification will seem sufficient to the Committee.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said it was believed that, even with the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, many districts would be much worse off than they were under the Necessitous School Boards Act.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Everybody thinks they will be worse off.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that this proposal did not hand the money over to the county. If the Bill had not been amended at all the money would not have issued, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have benefited by it. This was an oversight which the Government had now attempted to correct by the Amendment of the Leader of the House. It was still believed that this Amendment would make those districts worse off than they were under the Necessitous Schools Grant. They would be very badly off as compared with the county as a whole, and there was no ground why this should not be a charge on the whole of the area instead of being a charge upon the poor districts. He was sure any hon. Member of this House would admit that there was an extremely hard case where parishes had been lumped together, for they were very often parishes in which the question of the Church and Nonconformity did not arise. But the real point was that they lost the whole of the local control. They would have no vestige of any special interest in the school, and yet the debt on that school would remain with them instead of going to the county area. These were such extremely hard cases that the Government would be bound to find some remedy for them between now and the Report stage. He heartily supported the Amendment of his hon. friend.

DR. MACNAMARA said that those districts which had rated themselves for schools in the past should be enabled now to meet their liabilities out of the country rate. There were many parishes which had incurred liabilities because they set themselves rigidly against denominationalism and provided schools. In order to do this they had paid rates ranging from 1s. to 3s. 6d., and now it was proposed that, over and above the county rate, they were to be rated for having pursued a policy of progressivism rather than of obscurantism. Nothing could be more unfair. He instanced the parish of Roseland, in Cornwall, where the people had paid a rate of 1s. 10½d. In that parish 1d. in the £1 brought in £14, so that the yield of the rate imposed was about £300. They had paid that rate freely, while possibly their neighbours in the adjoining parishes had not rated themselves a farthing. These good people in Roseland had a liability of £3,600 to meet, and now, in addition to the county rate, they would have to pay in respect of that liability until the debt was wiped out. He quoted that case at random as illustrating what would happen, and it was not an extreme case. Indeed, it was a very moderate case. If the First Lord thought that these people were likely to look with favour on education in future he was very much afraid the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) urged that the provided schools should be put on the same basis as the voluntary schools in respect of the rent of teachers' houses. He had given notice of an Amendment to that effect, and he hoped the Government would put words into the Clause for that purpose.

*MR. CHANNING said he spoke as the representative of several School Board districts where there had been a heavy outlay on schools with a very heavy rate, and which were Necessitous School Boards, He wished to enter his emphatic protest against the sub-Section in its original form, and also against the inadequate remedy offered by the First Lord at the last moment in regard to districts which had, with great public spirit and enormous sacrifices, provided themselves with excellent schools.

(10.53.) Question put.

'That the words 'The County Council shall' stand part of the Clause.'"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 508.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George

Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Charles Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit William
Gibbs, Hn. A G H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent. Ashford
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus

Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, F'versh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Sttirling-MaxwelrSir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffi'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbysh)

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Mr. Channing.

It being after Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 41, after the word 'raise to insert the words 'such portion as they think fit, not being less than one-half or more than three-fourths of.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

(11.4.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 509.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard John (Kent Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C E H. (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton. und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne,Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon.CharlesH.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton,Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rankin, Sir James
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 42, after the word 'liabilities' to insert the words, 'on account of loans.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.18) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 236; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 510.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A. J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.HnSirJ(Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F
Maxwell, W. J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edwin Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col, John P. (Galway, N
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. H.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Harmsworth, R. (Leicester)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt Hn C.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas, F.Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Runciman.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 44, at the end, to insert the words, 'so far as it is within their area.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.31.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 238 ; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 511.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour,Kenneth R.(Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Capt.H.F.(Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD(Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale,Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurs
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H(CityofLond.
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(BurySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.

Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, Charles
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc, Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans

Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J. A(Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George(York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R,)
Woodhouse, Sir. J.T(Hudd'rsf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 12, at the end, to add the words, '(4) Where under any local Act the expenses incurred in any borough for the purposes of the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, are payable out of some fund or rate other than the borough fund or rate, the expenses of the council of that borough under this Act shall be payable out of that fund or rate instead of out of the borough fund or rate; (5) Where any receipts or payments of money under this Act are entrusted by the local education authority to any committee or managers, the accounts of these receipts and payments shall be accounts of the local education authority.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.44) Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 234; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 512.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William James
Bull, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D(Chatham)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzoy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edmn'ds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G(Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay,
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brfghtside
Hoult, Joseph

Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert,
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sasoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas

Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, Jaems
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred, W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Bell and Mr. Shackleton.

(11.57.) Question put, "That the Clause as amended stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 234; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 513.)

AYES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy M.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington. Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H, (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Ld. G. (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (D'mfri'ssh're
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan David J (Walthamstow

Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, MajJ.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton,Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashtonuud.Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumunt, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randall
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dewar, John A. Inverness-sh..
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William (Snowdon)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmathen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas,JA.(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 14:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 18, after the word 'borough,' to insert the words 'or urban district.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(12.8.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 219; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 514.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt HnJ. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliott, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj J. E. B (Isl of Wight)

Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E. C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J. A (Gl'morg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Broadhurst and Mr Fenwick.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 19, to leave out the second word 'borough.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(12.23.) Question put, "That the word 'borough' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 102; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 515.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of

Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-Hayter, Rt.Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(M'rthyr)
Thomas,JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson,Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Joseph Leese and Mr. Nussey.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour,Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHnJA(Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Capt Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett,A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratio D(Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt. Hon.SirJohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber,Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes,Hon.AilwynEdward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,SW.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H.(CityofLond.
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hon.George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon-Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian

Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,W J H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hereford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanark)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. Strand)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Walrond,RtHonSir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Asht'n-und-Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A.Stanley(York,E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 19, at the end, to add the words 'out of which the expenses of the Council under this Act are payable.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(12.35.) Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 204; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 516.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, AlexanderH. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratio D(Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edwin Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(BurySEdm'nds
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J. F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier,Hon JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, CaptainHerbertMerton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry

King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Manrice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Schwann and Mr. Brynmor Jones.

(12.45.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 517.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. HnJ. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir Edward Strachey and Mr. Beaumont.

Clause 15:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 29, to leave out the words, 'A local education authority,' and insert the words, 'An authority having powers under this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(12.58.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 88; Noes, 189. (Division List No. 518.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)

Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.CR(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Cameron and Mr. Frederick Wilson.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGerald W (Leeds
Balfour,Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles,Capt. H.F.(Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston,Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J.(Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler,Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas(Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashtonund.Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A. Stanley (York,E.R.

Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(1.8.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 186; Noes, 85. (Division List No 519.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dimsdale Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham. Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Wason and Mr. Duncan.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, lines 38 and 39, to leave out the words, 'which has power to adopt, or has adopted, Part III. of this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(1.18.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 520.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—
Mr. Weir and Mr. Corrie Grant.

NOES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles,Capt.H.F.(Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,AlexanderH.(Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,RtHn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,WJH.(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George.
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
StanleyEdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHnJ.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Tomlinson,SirWilliam Edw.M
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH.(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton,Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt.Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 43, to leave out the words from the word 'Act,' to the end of the Clause, and to add the words, 'and in that case the powers and duties of the authority under this Act shall cease, and the area of the authority if the powers and duties relinquished include powers as to elementary education, shall as respects those powers and duties be part of the area of the County Council.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(1.27.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 81; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 521.)

AYES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-shire
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Soares and Mr. Charles Morley.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.

Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfries-sh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(1.38.) Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176: Noes, 81. (Division List No. 522.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und, Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred, (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glmorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Burratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. Cleveland
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Allen and Mr. Goddard.

(1.48.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 523.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middles'x
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edmn'ds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George

Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Mr. Cremer.

Clause 16:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words, 'as respects a Provisional Order constituting an Eeducation Committee.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(1.59.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 81; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 524.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur,
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Humphreys-Owen and
Captain Norton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montague
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Ashton Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir, Horatio D. (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'ds
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd

Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F
Maxwell, W. J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamsto'
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritcnie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (I. of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and
Mr. Anstruther.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 18, to leave out the word 'but,' and insert the words, 'and any such scheme or any Provisional Order made for the purposes of such a scheme.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(2.10) Question put, "That the word 'but' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 77; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 525.)

AYES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. George White and
Mr. Toulmin.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs)
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt HnJ. A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin, Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W(B'ryS. Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G(Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John(Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Corrie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan, David J(Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexandra
Seeley, Maj. J E B(Isle of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr. E C(Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Shef'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(2.18.) Question put, "That the words, 'and any such scheme or any Provisional Order made for the purposes of such a scheme' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 168; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 526.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S' Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. E. J. B (Isle of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir Wm. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas

Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.HnC.R.(Northants
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,J A(Glam'rgan,Gower
Thomson, F.W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred. W (Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson,Henry J (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Charles Shaw and Mr. Batty Langley.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 19, at the end, to add the words 'as a scheme for establishing an Education Committee under this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(2.28.) Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 167; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 527.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour,Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H.F.(Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHnJA(Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett,A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratio D(Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fellowes,Hon. AilwynEdward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W(B'rySEd'mnds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Jessel,Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,WJ H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan,David J.(Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon. M.W(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson,Dr.EC(Monagh'n,N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sh'ffi'ld
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.

Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES,
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

NOES.

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thos. (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Henry J. Wilson and
Mr. Herbert Samuel.

(2.43.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 166; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 528.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Col. James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,W J H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway,N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Walrond,RtHn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar,John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone,RtHn. HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones,DavidBrynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,FredW.(Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson,Henry J.(York,W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham,Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Trevelyan.

Clause 17:—

(2.48) Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 61; Noes, 154. (Division List No. 529.)

AYES.

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Gladstone,Rt. Hn. Herbt. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hayne,Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley,Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur

Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHnC.R.(Northants
Thomas,JA(Glamorg'n,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Samuel Evans and
Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.HnJ A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chath'm
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S(Warwick,S.W
Godson,Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E W(B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,W J.H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie,RtHon,Chas.Thomas
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,RtHonSirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

The CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Quetion put.

Adjourned at Three o'clock, a.m.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 14th November, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next. — (*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Enfield (five); Southgate; Edmonton; Stirling; and Gloucester; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Frampton-on-Severn, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Wavertree, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Aldborough; Adlington; and Hunstanton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Additional Rule varying the Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 371.]

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Copy presented, of Eleventh General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 372.]

NAVAL EXPENDITURE AND MERCANTILE MARINE (GREAT BRITAIN ETC.).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th June; *Sir John Colomb*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 373.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2913 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY BOROUGHS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing (1) the total rateable value of each of the County Boroughs in Ireland; (2) the borrowing powers of each, distinguishing between their powers under the Public Health (Ireland) Act and local Acts (if any); (3) the amount borrowed by each County Borough on the security of the rates, distinguishing loans from (a) Local Loans Fund, (b) stock, (c) other sources (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January last); (4) the amount of loans repaid up to the 1st day of January last (exclusive of loans entirely repaid on the 1st day of January last); (5) the rate in the pound for all purposes levied in each County Borough during the years 1899, 1900, and 1901; and (6) the income (if any) of each County Borough from sources other than the rates." — (*Mr. O'Doherty.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Bill—Expenses of Local Education Authorities.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the loan expenses chargeable to present School Board areas will be included in the total expenses of the authority under Part III. of the Education Bill for calculating the Aid Grant payable to the local education authority.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The answer is in the affirmative.

Soldiers' Gratuities on Transfer to Reserve or Discharge.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether any applications for the allowance of £1 for each year's service since 1898 to which a soldier is entitled on discharge have been refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Article 1,123 of the Pay Warrant gives a gratuity of £1 a year on transfer to the reserve or discharge, under certain conditions, and there is naturally no record of a refusal to give the gratuity when the conditions have been fulfilled.

Foreign-made Pencils in Government Offices.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if directions have now been given that foreign pencils are no longer to be supplied to Government offices, and that pencils similar to those now in the Library of the House of Commons are to be substituted.

(*Answered by Mr Hayes Fisher.*) No such general directions can be given, irrespective of the price and quality of British and foreign pencils; but for some time past all ordinary pencils purchased by the Stationery Office (exclusive of telegraph pencils) have been of British origin. I am informed that coloured chalk pencils of the make and quality required for the public service cannot be obtained from British manufacturers. Similarly, it was necessary during the year 1901–1902 to purchase 725 gross of special drawing pencils of foreign make for the use of engineers, architects, surveyors, and draughtsmen. I desire to add that, for some time past, all black-lead pencils supplied to the House of Commons have been of British make.

Great Western Railway—Breakdown near Carmarthen.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been called to the breakdown on the Great Western Railway near Carmarthen, on the evening of Tuesday, 16th September; and whether any Board of Trade inquiry has been held into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Board of Trade have been informed by the Great Western Railway Company that on the date mentioned a train was delayed near the Ferryside Station owing to the failure of a portion of the eccentric gear upon the engine, but continued its journey as soon as another engine could be procured. Such an occurrence does not form a subject for an inquiry by the Board.

Crown Property in Scotland—Arrears of Income.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the Crown property in Scotland is stated to produce an income of £30,789 15s. 1d., and that arrears at the close of the year 1901–2 amounted to £4,822 11s. 4d., will he state the nature of the subjects in respect of which these arrears fell due; and whether any steps have been taken to recover them.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Of the entire sum outstanding, £4,433 is in respect of surplus teinds of Elgin parish claimed by the Crown in respect of crops 1856–1876 (first half), for which the heritors dispute their liability. The claim is in abeyance pending the adjustment of a final locality which will it is expected, make clear the rights of the parties. The balance consists of various items of small amount which are being dealt with. I may add that all arrears are fully investigated after the close of each financial year and any necessary steps then taken.

South Africa War—Charges against British Officers.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether the Report called for in reference to the charges made in the Cape Parliament on the 28th August has been received; and, if so, will it be published; are the cases being investigated; and, if so, by whom.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The letter calling for this Report was despatched some weeks ago. The Report will, therefore, in all probability, reach the War Office some time in December.

Army Promotions—Case of Veterinary Captain Spanton

MR. JOHN WILSON (Glasgow, St. Rollox): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been directed to the appointment of Mr. J. P. Spanton to the rank of Veterinary Captain; will he state what qualification he possesses; and if his appointment is in accordance with Article 431 of the Royal Warrant, and Paragraph 40 of the Yeomanry Regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Temporary Veterinary Captain Spanton was granted the honorary rank of Veterinary Captain on relinquishing his appointment as Veterinary Officer to the 1st Battalion Imperial Yeomanry. The regulations quoted do not apply to the case, as he has neither been appointed to a commission in the Imperial Yeomanry at home nor to one in the Army Veterinary Department.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE

Education Bill—The Government Amendments.

*(12.10.) Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I wish to ask whether the Secretary to the Education Department is prepared to make any statement with regard to the effect of the great changes which have this morning only been introduced into the new Grant in aid Clause. Unless an explanation is made forthwith, there may be no opportunity of giving one this afternoon. The money granted is obviously increased in the first part of the Clause, but the last part contains words of limitation the effect of which, I fear, may be more than to undo in some places what has previously been done.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I think the right hon. Gentleman has mistaken the effect of the Clause. I do not think it will have the effect which he seems to fear. Whatever happens with regard to the Committee stage of the money Resolution under the existing Rules, I may point out that the Report stage must come on on Monday, when there will be ample time for discussion.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): This is a great surprise.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is only entitled to ask a question.

Mr. WHITLEY: May I ask if it is not the fact that the three-fourth limit of the Parlimentary Grant is now proposed to be left out?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now arguing on the merits of the Amendment.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther, (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 18—

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) moved the omission of sub-Section (1.) He said that the sub-Section, in effect, defined all night school work as higher education, which was not merely absolute nonsense, but dangerous nonsense. At least 75 per cent. of the night school work in this country was purely elementary. The Government might see fit to call it higher education, but it could not be made higher education by calling it so, and to call it so would have a most dangerous effect. The Committee of Council's Report for the present year, signed by the Duke of Devonshire and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, said: "As in previous years, the principal subjects of instruction in evening schools under the Code were the elementary subjects—reading, writing, and arithmetic." Then the Report went on to say that 100,696 scholars qualified for the grant in arithmetic; 60,000 in writing and composition, 56,000 in reading and writing combined, and 28,000 in reading and recitation. The Report for the previous year also stated that the elementary subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic were more taught than any other in the evening schools. In 1900, 107,000 scholars qualified for the fee grant in arithmetic, 63,000 in writing and composition, 58,000 in writing and reading combined, and 29,000 in reading and recitation. There were hundreds of columns in the Educational Blue-books which bore out his argument, and the inspectors all admitted that the night school work was mainly of a purely elementary character. Dr. Williams, for instance, two years ago reported that while the evening schools continued to do good work, it was impossible to be blind to the fact that much of the time allotted to instruction in science was spent in teaching the elements of reading and writing. Mr. Saumarez said that the evening schools in country districts, particularly in Gloucestershire, could scarcely be called science schools, as their work was practically confined to reviving the dry bones of elementary instruction. Mr. Freeland, reporting from one of the northern districts, said that the great bulk of the night school work must remain purely elementary; while Mr. Danby, writing from the south-east district, said the majority of evening scholars attended the classes in order to make up their deficiences in elementary subjects, and to regain what they had forgotten of their school learning. There were men absolutely illiterate who had moral courage enough to sit down among lads, and in one case a man of forty years had joined a school so that he might be able to read the cricket scores in the *Brighton Argus* next summer. It was clear from all these reports that the great bulk of night school work was, and must remain, of an elementary nature, and, therefore, he impressed on the Government the extreme danger of the definition in the Clause. As to the financial effect, that would not make any difference with regard to county boroughs, which could raise as much money as they liked for elementary education, but it would put a rather heavy burden on the money at their disposal for other kinds of education. With the aid of a small grant from the Exchequer they had to provide for technical instruction, the development of higher education, and the training of pupil teachers, out of the rates, and if to that were to be added the provision of elementary night schools it would mean overburdening the amount of money at their disposal. He was told the other night that all he cared for was elementary instruction. If that were so he would hail with satisfaction this proposal of the Government, because it would leave so much more money free for elementary education by transferring the burden of these schools to the secondary education fund. But it was doing a serious injury to higher education, and, therefore, he opposed it. It was vitally essential to keep the night school in close touch with the day school; they must not have the two divorced, otherwise the children leaving the day school would never find their way into the night school. It might be all right in the county boroughs and the rural areas, where there would be practically one authority, but in the 140 municipal boroughs with over 10,000 population and the sixty-one urban districts with over 20,000 population, there would be no co-ordination of education, because the authority would be a divided one. This difficulty had arisen because of the enormous changes made in the Bill, and he would suggest to the Government that they should drop the definition Clause right out. It was not wanted now, and the Secretary to the Board of Education, recognising that a great deal of the work was elementary, could supply the local authorities with two codes—a night school code for elementary work and a night school code for higher work.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 28, to leave out sub-Section (1)."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed "That sub-Section (1) stand part of the Clause."

*(12.30) THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION Sir WILLIAM ANSON Oxford University) said this matter was not being discussed for the first time. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had no doubt advanced a formidable array of reasons why evening schools should continue to be regarded as public elementary schools.

DR. MACNAMARA: Some of them.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Government thought it was very desirable that there should be a definition of a public elementary school, and that definition they had endeavoured to put into this Clause. The present condition of the evening schools was very clearly and fully described by the late Vice-President of the Council in the debate which took place on the Education Estimates last year, when he described the evening schools as the most chaotic part of the whole of our chaotic system. The Government hoped that in the future adults would not have to go to evening schools in order to obtain education which they ought to have got in the public elementary day schools. It could not be said that the system described by the hon. Member was a satisfactory system. It was a reflection on the working of our elementary schools that so large a proportion of the evening continuation classes should be made up of adults who wanted to learn to read a newspaper. The Government hoped that state of things would be remedied, and that a very much smaller proportion of the work done in the evening schools would be of an elementary character. As the Clause stood, there was nothing to prevent elementary education being given in the evening schools. It was desirable that schools so miscellaneous in the character of their teaching, and so miscellaneous in the age of the persons who received that teaching, should be separated from the public elementary day schools, which were intended to provide the best education they could devise for boys and girls who had to go forth to the work of life. It must be borne in mind that some of the most valuable work of these evening schools was carried on outside the range of elementary education, and was not entitled to be paid for out of the rates, but was paid for out of the rates before the Cockerton judgment. The Government wanted to give full power to the local authorities to adapt the evening schools in their areas to the needs of their districts. He thought that the municipal authorities who would have the power to raise a penny rate under Clause 3 would not be slow to exercise that power to meet the wants of the population. He hoped that the local education authority would find no great difficulty in securing that elementary education should work on into higher elementary and secondary education with the smoothness that was desired to be effected by this Bill. The grants made to these evening continuation schools were liberal enough. Of course not less than 25 per cent. of the expenditure had to be provided out of the local contributions, but with the assistance now contemplated he did not think they would be starved, that the elementary education given in them would not be adequate to the requirements of the population, or that the higher education would in any way be found to be deficient for the wants of the particular area. The object of this Clause was really to differentiate the various classes of schools. They could not divide the work of one evening school into elementary and secondary. They must regard the evening schools as a whole, and give the local authority full power to deal with them. He could not help thinking that the Clause as it stood would promote smoothness of working both for the local authority and the Department, and the efficiency of the education given in the schools.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said the time at their disposal for discussion was very limited indeed, and he would, therefore, be as brief as possible. But he desired to point out that under the guise of a definition Clause they were introducing a substantial and important change. Technically, he admitted they were carrying out the Cockerton judgment and perpetuating what the Cockerton judgment declared to be the law. 'But for many years before that judgmnet was passed these schools were treated as elementary, and, therefore, in reversing their position they were making a new departure under the guise of an interpretation Clause. He had listened with interest to the speech of the Secretary to the Board of Education in defence of the Clause, but they could not ignore the fact that the largest part of the education given in most of the evening schools of the country was elementary, and it would have been a far simpler plan tc have either divided the elementary from the secondary education, or else to have invited the secondary authority to delegate the control of so much as was elementary to the elementary authority, which he was sure they would be willing to do. The hon. Gentleman had expressed a hope that secondary education would have ample provision made for it, and that elementary education would be so improved that the need for giving it in night schools would not continue. But those who were acquainted with the conditions of rural life well knew that for some time to come, at all events, many children in our rural districts would, unless our educational system was screwed up to a much higher point, leave the day schools imperfectly furnished with a knowledge of elementary subjects. Any clergyman who took an interest in school work would tell them that unless evening schools were provided the children would relapse into ignorance after leaving the day schools. They must adapt their system to that state of things and endeavour to keep young people between fifteen and seventeen years of age in touch with the elementary teachers. He was sorry that the Government did not realise the true facts of the case. There were three reasons why he objected to the scheme of this definition Clause. The first reason was that this education was elementary, and would continue to be elementary. What was the use of calling a thing by another name? It was elementary education before the Cockerton judgment, and the Cockerton judgment had not altered the facts. Secondly, the elementary part of the education given in these evening schools ought to be under the authority which controlled elementary education. That was common-sense. But under this Clause they were creating the overlapping and conflict of authority which the Bill was intended to remove. Lastly, there was the question of expense. It was common ground that their greatest need was to develop secondary education. Under this Clause they would take a large and costly branch of education and throw it over to secondary education. By doing so they made it less likely that the higher branches of secondary education could be provided for out of the rates. Fear of an increase in the rates would be the dominant feeling in many counties, and, as elementary education must be provided for, it would be secondary education that would go to the wall. That in itself was conclusive against this change, and in the interests of secondary education as well as of the children whose education had been neglected and for whom evening schools were so much needed, he earnestly hoped that the Committee would not approve this definition Clause.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that the evening schools used to be under two separate Departments of the Government and two separate local authorities. They were under the Science and Art Department and the Board of Education until the Cockerton judgment, which decided that no evening school could be a public elementary school if it taught persons above the age of childhood anything else than elementary instruction, gave the Board of Education an opportunity of putting an end to the chaos. During the last year or two these schools had ceased to be public elementary schools and had become schools for higher instruction. It was true that in the schools of higher instruction which took the place of the evening elementary schools, a great deal of elementary instruction was given; and it was a great disgrace to our elementary system that it should be necessary to teach again to young persons of seventeen the things which the public had already paid for them to learn. But this instruction was only given to prepare the pupils for technical education. Under a Minute issued by the Board of Education, power was reserved to School Boards to carry on evening schools for teaching elementary subjects to children; but in only twenty cases had the power been exercised. Now that the evening schools had been unified, it was proposed by this Amendment to establish again two classes—elementary evening schools and higher evening schools. Nothing could be more pernicious, because it would reintroduce the old confusion where there were two local education authorities. It would reintroduce the very system which he described as chaos in this House two or three years ago. The mischief was that the two authorities would overlap and establish rival schools, and in order to attract scholars they would teach not what the people needed to be taught, but what they wanted to learn; all sorts of inducements in the way of recreations would be offered to entice scholars to one school or the other. If the Amendment were carried it would not effect the object of its supporters, because without a definition of "evening schools" the law as laid down in the Cockerton judgment would prevail. It would undo all the good which in the last two years had resulted from the consolidation of the evening schools, and it would reintroduce chaos. He was astonished at the description given by the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen of the secondary education given in the country districts. It was not, except in some benighted regions of the country perhaps, the mere reopening of the village day schools in the evening.

MR. BRYCE: I know a case within thirty miles of London.

SIR JOHN GORST said that there were many benighted districts within 30 miles of London. In the very sparsely populated county of Cambridgeshire every young person had within reach a technical school in which metal work, basket work, and the like were taught. That was the sort of evening school that was wanted. It was not desirable to cover the country with evening schools for the purpose of teaching persons to read the newspaper so that they might have better access to the sporting intelligence. They wanted to provide proper evening schools where the instruction already received in day schools was carried to a higher level, and where technical instruction could be given to the people who deserved and needed it.

(12.55.) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said the right hon. Gentleman had no doubt pictured an ideal state of things, but the fact remained that there were hundreds of thousands of young people over the age of fourteen in need of elementary instruction, and if a hold were to be obtained over these young people it was most necessary to keep up their connection with the ordinary day schools. Were they now to put obstacles in their way of getting practical instruction, or should they help them? That was the point the Committee had to decide. As to the suggestion that these boys and girls ought not to need such instruction, it might be worth considering how far the Education Department Code was responsible for the defective way in which they were turned out. Our boys and girls unfortunately left the elementary schools at a much earlier age than was to be desired; they left at a period before they began to appreciate the advantage of knowledge, before even they appreciated the necessity of putting into practice the limited instruction they had received. Many at once entered on manual occupations in which they needed not to exercise their talents, except, perhaps, for the purpose of reading a newspaper, and it was not until they were seventeen or eighteen that they began to appreciate the necessity of reviving their limited educational acquirements. Was it well, then, to exclude them from the opportunity of doing so? This was one of the most important questions the Committee had ever discussed. He felt it was absolutely necessary that these young people should be kept in some sort of relationship with the day-school organisation. He had had some little experience of the training of young people in day schools, and he found that if there was between the ages of fourteen and sixteen a breaking off of these connections, it was extremely difficult to get them renewed. If, on the other hand, the connections were maintained unbroken, the boys and girls made friends with the teachers, good companionships were formed, and the elementary education gradually progressed into the secondary stage. If the Prime Minister had had practical acquaintance with some of these schools, he would have shown more sympathy with the desire to maintain them. No doubt at one time, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had said, a very chaotic condition did exist, but the local authorities could easily overcome that. In his own city they had succeeded to a very large extent by co-operation between the School Board and the Technical Education Committee. He did not see why there should be any danger of over-lapping, now that they had one authority under the Bill. There were two classes of young people they ought to cater for—those who, by reason of their ability, and the keenness of their desire for education, desired to avail themselves of the technical and secondary schools, and the still larger number who in their school days had not appreciated their somewhat limited opportunities of education and still required, therefore, instruction in the three R's. He did feel that the Committee were undertaking a very serious responsibility in not so arranging that the hundreds of thousands of young people who were willing to improve themselves in elementary education should not be deprived of future facilities. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that the School Boards had not availed themselves of the facilities which former Acts had given them in regard to the establishment of evening schools, but the regulations issued by the Board of Education were entirely responsible for that. He sincerely hoped that the Prime Minister would either delete this sub-Section or accept his more moderate Amendment which was on the Paper.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said he was entirely in sympathy with the hon. Member as to the evening continuation schools; but his belief was that the sub-Section would not discourage these evening schools. The County Council of his own county had found it to be perfectly easy to run these evening schools under the regulations of the Education Department, and he could not see why the new education authority should not be able to do so under the proposed regulations. He would like to remind the Committee that the Royal Commission on Secondary Education had recommended that the secondary education authority should have jurisdiction over the evening continuation schools. He knew that in many of these schools elementary subjects were taught, and he should object to any system which would prevent the education authority from providing such elementary education. It had been said that it would be impossible to adapt elementary to secondary education in the schools in the larger towns, but he thought that could be done by the powers of delegation given to the local education authority. He insisted that these evening continuation schools should be kept in touch with the higher education, and that the secondary education authority should have control over them.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he sympathised with the Amendment of the hon. Member for Norfolk. He felt that a great deal of difficulty had been raised in reference to this matter on purely academic grounds. It was impossible to draw a straight line between primary and secondary education, and these evening continuation schools had done a vast amount of good in helping to improve the elementary education of the working classes. They had had adult schools in Birmingham even before 1870, and in these schools the education of some of their ablest and best citizen had been developed. This system of mixed education which had grown up would be checked and destroyed if the Bill were passed in its present form. It was very important to give an opportunity to dull children, who had awakened to the importance of self-improvement, to acquire further advance in elementary education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would appeal to the Committee to come to a decision on the Amendment. The point was not a novel one, and the Committee had a great deal of work before it.

*SIR WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said he would respectfully take note of the appeal made by the Prime Minister, but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that this was a question which had not been largely dealt with by the Committee on its merits. This was purely an education question *per se*. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could show the Committee, if Clause 18 passed in its present shape, what would happen to boys and girls who had attained the adult limit of age, eighteen, and who were anxious to improve themselves further. In all the technical schools at present it was found necessary to provide elementary instruction for a certain class of children coming up from the Board Schools. Without further elementary instruction they could not begin to understand even the terms used in elementary science teaching. Consequently these boys and girls would have no chance of obtaining that education afterwards. Instead of there being a link in the chain between secondary and elementary schools, there would be a void which could not be filled by any provision whatever contained in this Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman or the Secretary to the Board of Education could only say that under the provisions of this Bill the local education authority could provide in secondary schools for higher elementary education, then there would be some possibility of connecting the elementary and secondary schools as one co-ordinated whole. In the absence of this provision many children would not be fitted to enter the secondary schools. He should like to be informed whether the Bill sufficiently provided for the continuance of the education of those children who left elementary schools under the age of fifteen years. Possibly those children might get the degree of higher elementary education in the secondary schools. What provision was there in this Bill for such children to develop their faculties just at the time of life which above all others was most important for their own advancement? It was in this particular aim and this particular connection of one class of education with the other that the future of this country very largely depended for its intelligence. In all the technical schools with which he was acquainted they had to provide elementary classes for the children coming out of Board Schools, in order that they might be prepared for the secondary education provided in these technical schools. In this respect the Bill was an unmitigated retrogression against the interests of education as a whole, because there was nothing in this measure to provide in the future for the bridging over of this difficulty in such a manner as would give to this country those educational advantages which other countries possessed.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Hertfordshire, N.) thought that they ought to carry out the desire of the Prime Minister and not carry this discussion to any further length. He agreed with the Government in regard to the method of conducting the evening continuation schools. There was a certain amount of contradiction about this proposal, because in Clause 2 it was laid down that—

> "The local education authority may supply, or aid the supply of, education other than elementary."

It seemed to him that some difficulty might arise on that point. If there was a good reply to that question he should like to have an authoritative answer from the Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick), said if he might venture to make a guess at the answer of the Government to the question put by the hon. Gentleman opposite it would be that there was no answer at all. The Government were trying to do what was impossible; they were drawing a hard and fast line between higher and elementary education, and they were doing this to prevent overlapping. There was a danger that they might have two sets of schools under different authorities competing one with the other in the same area and trying to draw the scholars from one school to another. How was that to be obviated? Certainly not by drawing a hard and fast line. The way out of the difficulty was to consider what was laid down in the discussion upon the first Clause of the Bill. If the Government would reconsider the arguments then used about higher education, and have the courage to carry out more the principle of one authority, they would do away with this difficulty. Then they would get education co-ordinated. There was a want of co-ordination not only between the different kinds of education but also between the different kinds of education given in the same schools. The schools would be under one authority in the day time and another in the evening. This difficulty all arose on account of the mistake made in the beginning of the Bill and if they would only deal with that, this difficulty, which was solely the creation of the Government, could be easily removed by carrying this principle to its logical conclusion.

(1.25.) COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping), referring to the evening continuation schools, asked what did they find was in reality done? They found that the boys left school at a much too early age and went to work. They became either discontented or anxious to know more than they did before. They came to think that there was a possibility of them adding more to the wage-earning power of the family, and they returned to the evening continuation schools. Take as an illustration the eastern counties. They could not tell him that the bulk of the children going to the evening schools were fit to begin the elementary part of what was called secondary education. Many of those boys and girls if they did not attend the evening schools were unable, after a time, even to read and write, and if they were anxious to continue their education it was the elementary portion they required. Their anxiety was to be able to read and write correctly and fit themselves for secondary education. If elementary education was to be allowed to form part of the evening school work, the proper authority would be the same body as conducted the elementary education. He confessed that he felt extremely anxious about this proposal.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) thought the late Vice-President of the Council had taken too generous a view of the class of work done under the Code in evening continuation schools. When he said they had become "schools of higher instruction," the fact was a large proportion were teaching the three R's. They ought to have this Bill so worded that the education which was elementary should still be under the Elementary Department of the Government whether in day or night schools. The Secretary of the Board of Education had told them that this work in the boroughs would be continued under the penny rate, which would be still available for secondary instruction. But it was already absorbed, and he thought it was unfair that in those districts which were willing to tax themselves with an additional penny rate that the money intended for the higher educational and technological work of the locality should be applied to lower standards. These continuation schools had been a great success. The pupils had inceased from 96,542 in 1892 to 546,405 in 1901,therefore let them be kept in touch with day schools and not be transferred to county authorities. Continuity of instruction was the great thing which they desired. They found children leaving the day school with imperfect education, and then waking up to the necessity of beginning again. He thought the greatest possible inducement should be given to these young people, and if the true interests of the country were studied the Government would see to it that it was made as easy as possible for these young people to get again on the educational ladder. The number attending these evening classes over twenty-one years of age in 1892 was 4,993, but in the year 1901 that total had increased to 90,516. That showed conclusively that there was a great need for these schools. They must not be restricted in matter of age limit, but be free as now to those of any age who desired to attend them over fifteen. He joined in pressing the Government to alter the Clause accordingly.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said that surely the Government must see that there was a considerable difference of opinion upon this proposal on both sides of the House. In the rural areas a difficulty undoubtedly existed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had sketched a fancy picture of what should be, but the hon. and gallant Member who had just spoken had stated the facts which they must recognise today. There was the gravest danger that in small villages evening continuation schools would be crushed out of existence. There was no class more deserving of assistance under the Bill than children who, having been obliged to leave school at a very early age, desired to improve themselves by going to these evening continuation schools. He believed it was beyond the wit of man to define what was primary and what was secondary education. And surely it was ridiculous to say that work done in a school between 9 and 12 o'clock in the day was primary education, and that the same class of work done between 7 and 9 o'clock in the evening was higher education. He appealed to the Government to find some way out of the difficulty. The Clause was not satisfactory, and the Amendment was not satisfactory. Surely between this and the Report stage the right hon. Gentleman would be able to find some form of words which would enable the elementary evening continuation schools to be continued, and thus meet the wishes of both sides of the Committee without destroying in any way the fabric of his Bill. Something must be done for these children. They were often those who had been neglected when very little and who now had a laudable ambition to improve their position. Unless some satisfactory assurance was given he should support the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Government were perfectly clear that they must differentiate between primary and secondary education, for the reason, if for no other, that there were a large number of boroughs which had the right to give primary education but not secondary education. He had not forgotten that hon. Gentlemen opposite had contended that these boroughs should have been placed for primary as well as secondary education under the heels of the County Councils. It was very easy for critics, who had not to carry the Bill, to say how very nice the Bill would be if it ran on lines more theoretically perfect. But that had never been a possible policy. It was not a possible policy now. They had to deal with facts as they found them. He was convinced that any attempt to turn a primary school into a secondary school would lead to that overlapping which they all wished to avoid. The difficulty was to reconcile two perfectly sound views; the view of the Government—that true secondary education ought to be clearly defined so as to prevent overlapping, and the other view that if there was a limit of age there was included in that something that was not secondary education and never could be. In secondary education was included the teaching of very elementary subjects, but that was only intended as a step to the higher education, and if a boy when sent to our great public schools was put in the lowest form he would get education which might be called elementary, but which there was no doubt was secondary, from the very beginning. Sub-Section (1) must stand in some form. To meet the difficulty he suggested the addition of the following words at the end of the sub-Section—

> "Other than a school in which no other education is given except such as is given in a primary elementary day school."

MR. BRYCE thought the proposed words would be an improvement on the sub-Section.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY also said that the Amendment was a very great improvement on the sub-Section, and that it would remove the major part of the difficulty.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) thought the real difficulty of the Committee was in trying to define too closely and too rigidly the duties of the local education authority. What was required was to place more trust and more confidence in the local authorities than was now being done. He did not think that what was being taught in night schools could in any way be described as secondary education, because all it did was to take a boy at the age, say, of thirteen or fourteen, and lead him on and fit him to receive the secondary education that would be provided for him. The tendency of the human mind was to forget, and if this limit was left and the boy suddenly taken away from school he would forget all that he had learnt. In the night schools the boy would not only increase his knowledge but remember that which he already possessed. He desired to support the proposal that the continuation schools should be placed unreservedly under the local education authority.

SIR JOHN GORST said nobody wanted to stop these night schools, or to take them out of the purview of the local authority, and there would be no difficulty at all if it were not for the existence of certain urban districts and boroughs in which there were two local authorities. He entirely agreed with the First Lord of the Treasury that this, though a theoretical blemish on the Bill, was a thing which was essential to the passing of the measure through the House. The question was, to which of the two authorities — the county authority or the borough or urban district authority—the control of these schools should be given. It was essential that there should not be two kinds of authorities, otherwise the whole difficulty which had embarrassed the Board of Education for years, and which the Cockerton judgment put an end to, would be reintroduced. There were at present different schools giving technical, secondary, and elementary education. Why disturb them, or interfere with a proceeding now going on with great satisfaction, and to the great advantage of education, by insisting on reintroducing the evil of two rival authorities?

(1.50.) MR. BRYCE said he was sensible of the difficulty which the right hon. Gentleman felt in adopting words on the spur of the moment, but he suggested the following form of words—"The expression 'elementary school' shall not include any evening school which the regulations of the Board of Education shall declare to be secondary or technical."

* MR. HELME said before the Prime Minister replied he would urge him to promise that provision should be definitely made for the giving of instruction in the evening continuation schools to pupils of any age over 15, and also that the term "school" should include "class," because in many wide rural districts it was impossible to establish a proper school, and so the authorities might have at times to be content with a single class in each village.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not say that he was quite satisfied with the form of words suggested, and yet he was not quite happy about leaving the matter entirely till the Report stage. An hon. Gentleman opposite had courteously handed him words which he thought were simpler than his hon. friend's words—"where any part of the education given is other than elementary." It was, however, quite possible that that might not prove satisfactory on further consideration, and he was ready to leave the matter over.

DR. MACNAMARA urged that the words first suggested were preferable. He was afraid, however, that under the words as they stood, it would not be possible to give even elementary education to anybody over fifteen years of age, in a night school. He would like an assurance that such a thing would be provided against.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that that followed as a matter of course.

DR. MACNAMARA: But if there is any legal doubt about it, the Government will attend to it?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Yes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if he gave a promise to deal with the matter on Report it must be subject to the exigencies of the Parliamentary situation, but he would do his best to meet the situation. The Government held that secondary education in the true sense of the word—that was to say, education which, though it went to the higher subjects, might begin lower, and which in its essentials was to be distinguished from primary education, and was not a mere continuation of primary education—ought to rest with the education authority. On the other hand, they quite admitted that in those districts where primary education proper was left to a subordinate authority, that authority ought not to be prevented from giving what was truly primary education to persons who were above the age of fifteen. That was really the point. That which was strictly elementary before the age of fifteen did not cease to be elementary after that age, and the Government would endeavour to find some method by which that point should be covered.

DR. MACNAMARA suggested that the Prime Minister would get out of his difficulty by accepting the first form of words. All danger from "Parliamentary exigencies" would then be avoided.

* MR. ERNEST GRAY said he also should prefer the bird in the hand, having regard to Parliamentary uncertainties.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) wished the Prime Minister had more confidence in his own words. The first form was much wider than the second.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said they had always declared they could not define what "education other than elementary" was, but they could draw the line as to what was the education given in public elementary schools. He therefore hoped the right hon. Gentleman's first words would be adopted.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) urged that the widest possible scope should be given to the powers necessary for carrying on the continuation schools.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said the words he had suggested were "where the education given was other than elementary." The difficulty was that by the words of the Prime Minister the situation was that no school could be an elementary school where there would be a single class teaching a secondary subject, because then that school would not be an elementary school.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he hoped the Committee would allow them to finish this sub-Section. He proposed to add at the end of the sub-Section the words—

"Where any part of the education given is other than elementary."

He hoped the Committee would allow the Clause to pass down to the end of sub-Section (2).

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 31, after 'education,' to insert the words 'where any part of the education given is other than elementary.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Amendment agreed to. (2.0.)

(2.30.) MR. BRYCE said he wished to move the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper, to insert after "the Board of Education" the words "to pupil teachers and." The education to be given to pupil teachers was so purely elementary that no argument was necessary to recommend his Amendment to the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 35, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'to pupil teachers and.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he was afraid that the Government could not accept this Amendment.

SIR JOHN GORST said he hoped that the Government would not accept the Amendment since it would stop the education of pupil teachers in secondary schools, which he hoped would go on. This was one of the projects by which the School Boards invaded the domain of secondary education. They could not hold to the old system, and it was better now to encourage real secondary education in schools where the pupil teachers would be trained to the teaching profession.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said that if he thought for a moment that the result of his right hon. friend's Amendment would be to destroy the instruction of pupil teachers in the secondary schools he would be disposed to agree with the right hon. the Member for Cambridge University. If it was proposed to give a far higher sum out of Government resources in aid of higher education, he did not see why an arrangement might not be made to cover the expense of such teaching.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that it seemed to him that the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman was of the most reactionary kind ever made in the course of these debates. He had always thought that one of the great things which they ought to aim at was to raise the character and the tone of pupil teachers from the beginning of their career to their final employment under the Education Code. He had taken the deepest interest for many years in pupil teachers' centres, which occupied a position between the elementary and the secondary schools. If they were to give a higher tone to elementary education they must endeavour to do it by the influences coming from a higher secondary education. He thought that great injury had been done to education by some of the concessions which the Government had made already, and he hoped the Government would not go further in the direction of degrading instead of elevating education.

MR. BRYCE said he attached importance to the Amendment because he thought it was valuable; but he recognised the fact that it was in the power of the Government to defeat it, and he asked leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

DR. MACNAMARA said be wished to move as an Amendment, to strike out the words in sub-Section (2), limiting instruction in public elementary schools to "scholars of not more than fifteen years of age." Assuming that these words were put in by way of compliance with the Cockerton judgment, he maintained that there was nothing in that judgment to require promising children to be resolutely turned out of the school at the age named. In rural districts, where it would not be always possible to switch off a scholar to a secondary school in some neighbouring town, the restriction in the Clause would have most deplorable results. In Scotland, the Code provided that children might stay in the public elementary schools until they were eighteen years of age; and there were, roughly speaking, 7000 pupils in elementary schools in that country over fifteen years of age. Why should they in England, be debarred from having at east as many pupils staying in the elementary schools, whose parents were content to allow them to remain there, in order to get a little beyond the rudiments of ordinary instruction? He sincerely hoped he would not appeal in vain for this modification of the Clause. Although he sympathised with the desire that gave birth to it, he opposed the fifteen years of age limit because he was convinced that it would create gaps in secondary education. If working men were prepared to allow their children to remain at school and forego their earning capacity, the least the country could do was to permit the children to remain at school

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 36, to leave out the word 'of not more than fifteen years of age.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

*(3.0.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON said this age limit was a matter of policy from which the Government could not depart. The Scotch system was different from the English in that, in Scotland, elementary and secondary education were dealt with in the same schools. One of the main objects of this Bill was to secure that, when their public elementary course was concluded, children who had the time and opportunity should have every chance of getting a higher education in secondary schools. The opinion of the Government was that a school must be one thing or the other. Elementary day schools were intended for boys and girls who, about the age of fifteen, had to go and make their way in life. After that age evening and secondary schools were provided for them, if they had the opportunity to use them. If they had not the opportunity, all that could be done was to provide as good a system of public elementary education as was possible. In the elementary schools it was desirable to concentrate the attention of the teacher on the children generally, and not to lead an ambitious teacher to apply him self to push a clever child. If the age limit were extended there would be an infinitely greater variety of children in the schools, there would be a risk that the duller children would be left behind, and public elementary teaching not be as good as that which the Government hoped would be obtained. Another objection to the abolition of the age limit was that it would bring elementary schools into competition with secondary schools, and that was the very thing the Bill was designed to prevent. The Government did not think it necessary to take the Scotch system into consideration, believing, as they did, that the best system for England was the one they had adopted. When the hon. Member said that the children would be ruled out at the age of fifteen, he might say that the Government would be quite prepared to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, which would allow a child to complete his school year, though he might attain the age of fifteen before the end of it.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the promise of the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen to allow a child trained in an elementary school to complete his school year after he reached fifteen, was satisfactory as far as it went; but the Committee were very disappointed to hear the hon. Gentleman defend Clause 18 as it stood. As he understood the hon. Gentleman he was still confined in his ideas to the old distinctive division between the elementary and secondary education, This Bill proposed to allow the local authorities to provide two kinds of instruction; but he (Mr. Yoxall) thought it might best be left to the local authorities to draw the line where it was thought it ought to be drawn. It might suit a locality to say that both kinds of education should go on in the one school, which might be more economical than otherwise. The object of the Government in this case was clear—it was to enable them to identify a child in the secondary school to whom they were giving the grant. But his argument was, that the hon. Gentleman might give the grant to the same child in a higher elementary school. He contended that if a child could get another year of continuous education in an elementary school it would be far cheaper than if he went to a secondary school for it. He regretted that the hon. Gentleman had thought well to stand up for this particular Clause, which was unnecessary, which was not inherent to the Bill and which was a legacy left by a mischief-making Vice-president to the Board of Education.

SIR JOHN GORST said the difference between the hon. Member opposite and the Board of Education was that the hon. Member would give clever children a sham secondary education, and the Board of Education desired to give them a real one. The hon. Member recommended the keeping of the children in elementary schools because it was cheaper, and it cost less to give a boy the extra instruction in an elementary school. That was the kind of recommendation which the hon. Gentleman made of this proposal. The idea of the Board of Education was that it was better to take the clever children out of the elementary schools and to give them the higher education their talents deserved. There was, no doubt, a strong temptation to the teacher to keep a clever boy, and it was much better that he should go where he would meet other boys as clever as himself, rather than that he should remain a conceited, overtaught, overweening boy in an elementary school where, to use a vulgar expression, he was cock of the walk. In the rural districts he would get to the secondary school by the proper method of county scholarships. There were already in almost every county in England county scholarships by which promising boys and girls could pass from elementary schools to higher schools. Under the present Bill this so-called education ladder would, no doubt, be greatly improved. That was the real way to deal with clever boys. It was no use keeping clever and promising pupils in elementary schools, where they did not get the higher instruction which their talents merited. If we wanted a national system of education it was essential that we should make our system a "capacity-catching machine," by which capable children would be taken to a higher school where they could really get the sort of instruction they needed.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) thought that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had given a more encouraging support to the Bill than he did formerly. He regretted the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board of Education, that the Scotch system was not applicable to England. It was necessary that the first rung of the educational ladder should be in the elementary school, and now, so far as he could see, the Government intended not only to knock away that first rung, but the last rung also. If county scholarships were in general prevalence all over England, one would not care so much, but it was not upon that ground that the hon. Gentleman had defended the proposal of the sub-Section. He dissented entirely from the view that the Scotch system was not desirable or practicable in England.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) thought the decision at which the Government had arrived was due to a lack of knowledge of the country districts and the difficulty in the way of the scholars attending secondary schools. The authority would not be able to provide many secondary schools, and if the boys and girls were taken away from the elementary schools at fifteen, there was no place in the counties where they could continue their studies. In the boroughs, where secondary schools could be formed, it would be no doubt an easy matter, but in the counties it would be a difficult thing for the children to get secondary education; they would be cut off from school life altogether. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had rather exaggerated the power to obtain scholarships; besides which he (Mr. Wilson) did not agree with a policy which would only take account of the superior pupils. There were many other pupils who might be of great use to their country, but whose intellects were less ready in learning. In many districts there were boys and girls who at sixteen or seventeen years of age began to realise that they had not previously made the best use of their time, and wished to make good their deficiencies. He submitted that this provision would interfere with the proper equipment of our boys and girls for competition with other nations. He hoped the Government would reconsider their decision.

*(3.30.) SIR FRANCIS POWELL sympathised with the feeling expressed by the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the Committee, but reminded hon. Gentlemen that throughout the whole of Western Europe thirteen was the age limit for primary education. In one or two Swiss cantons it was fourteen. With regard to Scotland, he had observed that for that country there was no such thing as an Elementary Education Act, and it was owing to the fact that it was an "Education Act," and not an Elementary Education Act, that there was such a great difference between the education of Scotland and England. Another objection to raising the age limit was that it would be necessary to have a higher class in the elementary school, which had a great attraction to the elementary school teacher, and which, in his opinion, would be more or less disastrous to elementary education. Children at the present time were not sufficiently well grounded; the teachers and the parents of the children were, he thought, too ambitious, and the children were pressed on too much, and he thought it would be better to give the children a more thorough foundation of knowledge, and not to increase the age limit.

DR. MACNAMARA asked if the Government would be prepared to allow the local authority a discretion to retain a pupil beyond the age of fifteen if there should be no provision for higher education within the district.

MR. BRYCE said he believed that one of the methods recommended by the Secondary Education Commission was in this direction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could only undertake to consider this point, which had but a distant relation to the Amendment.

DR. MACNAMARA, relying on this consideration, begged leave to be allowed to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BRYCE thought that the Amendment he now moved, to permit the local education authority to allow a scholar to remain in a school to the end of the school year in which he or she attained the age of fifteen years, was obviously a convenient one, and as he understood the Government proposed to accept it, he would move it without any further observation.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 37, at end, to insert the words 'but any scholar may remain in such school to the close of the school year in which he or she reaches the age of fifteen.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 37, at end, to insert the words '(3) Where before the passing of this Act fees have been charged in any public elementary school the local education authority shall, while they continue to charge fees in respect of that school, pay such proportion of those fees as may be agreed upon, or, in default of agreement, determined by the Board of Education, to the managers.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax), on a point of order, called attention to the fact that this point had already been decided by the Committee, and therefore, he submitted, this Amendment was out of order. The Committee on the previous day had passed the words on the top of page 6, in Clause 13, that the fees of any school should be paid to the authority.

*THE CHAIRMAN thanked the hon. Member for pointing out this matter, but regretted that he had not had the hon. Gentleman's assistance before. Having had to give way once, he saw no alternative but to give way again.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON, on the point of order, submitted that sub-Section (3) was not in order. It was an Amendment to a definition Clause and had nothing to do with it. There was nothing in the Clause except definitions of matters incidental to the Clauses. This had nothing whatever to do with definitions, and it was absolutely out of order in its present place.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY read sub-Section (2) and sub-Section (5,) and pointed out that neither of them were really definitions.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON pointed out that both the provisions alluded to by the hon. and learned Attorney General were limited. He submitted that this Amendment was out of order.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he was disposed to agree. He thought that this was really a definition Clause; both the second and fifth sub-Sections were definitions, and, that being so, the Amendment would be out of order.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 41, at end, to insert the words '(4) In this Act the expression "minor local authority" means the council of any borough or urban district, or the parish council or (where there is no parish council) the parish meeting of any parish, which appears to the County Council to be served by the school. Where the school appears to the County Council to serve the area of more than one minor local authority the County Council shall make such provision as they think proper for joint appointment by the authorities concerned.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. BRYCE, in the absence of the hon. Member for East Nottingham, begged leave to move the Amendment standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 41, at end, to insert the words '(4) In this Act the words "persons," and "managers," shall include women.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY objected that this would tend to throw doubt on the general proposition that "persons" included either sex. He thought it was quite unnecessary to put such a definition in the Bill.

MR. BRYCE suggested that it was not a definition at all, but an enactment.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that in substance it was a definition.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WHITLEY said he desired to move the Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. Member for East Somerset.

* THE CHAIRMAN: Is that a definition?

MR. WHITLEY submitted that the words, "The powers of a local education authority under this Act shall include" was a very clear definition indeed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 3, at end, to insert the words 'The powers of a local education authority under this Act shall include the provision of vehicles or the payment of reasonable travelling expenses for teachers or children attending school whenever the local education authority shall consider such provision or payment required by the circumstances of their district or of any part thereof.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 3, to add, as a new sub-Section, '(5) In this Act the expression "college" includes any educational institution, whether residential or not.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had not had time to look into it, but he would like to know whether the term "educational institution" included theological institutions, because they also were educational institutions.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) asked whether the term "educational institution" would include hostels where no lectures were given, but where students lived, and which were affiliated to some other institution to which the students went by day for the purpose of lectures, because in Clause 4 there was a certain ambiguity. "Hostels" were included in some cases and left out in others.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked whether the words "educational college" had been brought into any other Clause except Clause 4.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said a hostel which was simply a boarding house would not be included. If it was affiliated to another institution, no question would arise, because then it would be part of a whole, and would be an educational institution; but it would not, by itself, be an educational institution.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Then I move to insert after "educational institution" the words "not being a theological college."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'institution' to insert the words 'not being a theological college.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said these words were not wanted. Practically speaking, this was a definition for the purposes of Clause 4 of the word "college," which did not appear elsewhere. A theological college was not the sort of institution that Clause 4 dealt with; it did not include a theological college.

MR. BRYCE said that, as a matter of fact, the word occurred again in Clause 13, but that did not affect this question much.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was perfectly well aware that such a thing was not contemplated, but he wanted to know whether it would be legal for a local authority to subsidise theological seminaries. He did not think they ought to be subsidised, though, if they were, Wales, in all probability, would derive the greatest advantage. But it ought to be made clear that such a thing should not be done.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it was clear that the local authority would be able to assist a theological college. He did not see why the local authority should be forbidden to assist one sort of college more than any other sort of college.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was glad they had got at it at last. At first he was told that Clause 4 would cover the case; now it was clear that it did not. This was one of the little surprises of the Bill. Let it be clearly understood that it was perfectly possible under this Bill to endow any theological seminary of any denomination or sect. The book of revelation was not yet closed, in spite of the guillotine. He should press the Amendment as a protest against it.

(3.53.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 94; Noes, 191. (Division List No. 530.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston

Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. M'Kenna.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway N.)

O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon M. W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt. Hn. Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Col. Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler,Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E.(W. Bromwich
Stanley,Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHonJ.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,Dr EC(Monagh'n'N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,RtHonSir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.Tauntou
Whiteley,H(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Words [of Sir WILLIAM ANSON'S Amendment] inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 4, to leave out the words 'local education authority' and insert the word 'council.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 7, at end, to add: 'And shall include power to provide or assist in providing scholarships for, and to pay or assist in paying the fees of, students ordinarily resident in the area of the local education authority at schools or colleges or hostels within or without that area.

"'(6) The county councillors elected for an electoral division consisting wholly of a borough or urban district, whose council is a local education authority for the purpose of Part III. of this Act, or of some part of such a borough or district, shall not act or vote in respect of any question arising before the County Council as regards matters under Part III. of this Act.

"'(7) A woman is not disqualified, either by sex or marriage, for being on any body of managers or Education Committee under this Act.'"—(*Sir Wm. Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) moved to leave out sub-Section 6 in order to insert the words "For the purposes of this Act the census of 1901, until superseded by any future census, shall be the test of population." He pointed out that many districts at present just under the population limit would soon be over that limit, and it would be unfair that they should be permanently denied the powers given under this Bill. The Amendment really required no explanation, and he hoped the concession would be made.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 8, to leave out sub-Section (6), and insert the words 'For the purposes of this Act the census of 1901, until superseded by any future census, shall be the test of population.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY objected that if the status of a borough or urban district was to vary from time to time according to its population they would never know how they stood.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS pointed out that some districts might increase largely in population, while other districts would decrease. The scheme of the Government, therefore, did not confer the advantages of the Bill on the increasing populations, while perpetuating the rights possessed by populations which were diminishing. Moreover, his recollection was that the Prime Minister had previously stated that districts would vary according to the variation of the population. He thought the matter ought to be determined by the population of the locality for the time being.

(4.15.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 202; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 531).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour,Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Barry,Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt.H.F.(Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.HnSirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard,J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Lambton,Hon.Frederick Wm.
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower.FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.AGraham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon.M W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B(Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,HonArthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.AC.E(Taunton
Whiteley,H (Ashton-und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson,A. Stanley(York,E.R.)

Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Edward Strachey and Mr. Channing.

(4.26.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 206; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 532.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscowen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes

Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (M'dstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George David
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.

Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn. C. R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJ. T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

It being half-past Four of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every question necessary to dispose of the allotted business.

Clause 19:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 10, after the second word 'the,' to insert the words 'First and.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(4.38.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 533.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, RtHnJ. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt HnSir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A G H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirEW(B'ryS. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, RtHon. WilliamEdw. H.
Legge, Colonel Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, WJ H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hon. SirFrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, RobertJasper(Shropshire
Morgan, David J(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur

Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon.M.W(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,Dr.EC.(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James

Tomlinson,SirWilliamEdw.M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.EH(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.HnSirWilliam H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col.AC.E.(Taunton
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidst'ne
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred

Jones,David Brynmor(Swanesa
Kitson, Sir James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke, (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,Sir JT.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Samuel Evans.

(4.48.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 204; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 534.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt Hn.Gerald W.(L'ds
Balfour,Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.

Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H.F.(Middlesex)
Bowles,T.Gibson (Lynn Regis)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,AlexanderH.(Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHnJA.(Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett,A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hn.H.A.G.(CityofLond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St.Albans)
Godson,SirAugustus Frederick
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,WJH.(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir FrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan,DavidJ(Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon.M.W(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,Dr.EC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH.(Sheffield
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.AC.E.(Taunt'n
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas, (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight

Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir John Brunner and Mr. Runciman.

Clause 20 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, line 31, to leave out from the word 'authorities' to the end of line 35, and insert the words, 'the period during which local authorities may, under the Education Act, 1901, as renewed by the Education Act (1901) (Renewal) Act, 1902, empower School Boards to carry on the work of the schools and classes to which these Acts relate shall be extended to the appointed day, and in the case of London to the twenty-sixth day of March, nineteen hundred and four.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(5.2) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 65 ; Noes, 204. (Division List, No. 535.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Craig, Robert Hunter
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. John Wilson (Durham) and Mr. Cremer.

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C

Davenport, Wm. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Graham. Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H. (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry

Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)

O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert.
Pym, C. Guy

Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot. Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H (Sheffield

Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Words inserted.

(5.13.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 197; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 536.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour,KennethR.(Christch.)
Barry,Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
BeresfordLordCharles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex)
Bowles,T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Wocr
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratio D(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, SirWilliam Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,HnA.G.H.(City of Lond.
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St.Albans)
Godson,SirAugustus Frederick
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,WJ.H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper (Shropshire
MorganDavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
PeaseHerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(BethnalGreen
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,ColSirC.E.H(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)

Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P., Glouc. (Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

EDUCATION ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of certain annual grants to local education authorities in pursuance of any Act of the present session to make further provision with respect to education in England and Wales."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

It being after half-past Four of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put the Question forthwith.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS, seated, and with his hat on, asked whether there would be an opportunity of discussing in Committee the proposals of the Government which were the basis of this Financial Resolution, and which were only put on the Paper yesterday.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) asked what position they were now in with reference to this Resolution.

*THE CHAIRMAN: This is the Committee stage on the Financial Resolution which is referred to in the Resolution the House passed on 11th November. That Resolution says that the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution will be terminated on Friday, 14th November.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: My point is that that Resolution was obtained from the House on the basis of the proposals of the Government which were put down so far back as 23rd July, and that the Government have substituted for these proposals other proposals which appeared on the Paper only yesterday or today.

*THE CHAIRMAN: These proposals are not being passed now. They will come on on Monday.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: Can they be discussed?

*THE CHAIRMAN: They will be discussed on Monday.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: Supposing they are not reached until such time as the guillotine drops, can we then discuss them?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first Order on Monday will be the Report of the Financial Resolution; that will open the door to discussion; and, if that is not sufficient, the new Clause relating to the aid grant will be the second Order.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: That, of course, refers to the Report Stage of this Resolution, but the question is whether we shall have any opportunity in the Committee Stage which we are now in, of discussing the proposals which appeared on the Paper for the first time yesterday, after the Closure Rule had been passed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There will be no opportunity of discussing the Clause which was put down and has been withdrawn; there will be an opportunity of discussing the Clause now on the Paper.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: But can we not discuss this Resolution in Committee?

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Resolution passed on Tuesday prevented discussion now.

(5.28.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 191; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 537.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cok, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edgar Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H. (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Lt.-Col. A. C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lewis, John Herbert
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Wallace and Mr. Ellis Griffith.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [LORDS].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 17*th November*, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade—

I. Authorising the construction of: (1) A light railway in the county of Southampton from Bentley to Borton; (2) Light railways in the city of Wakefield, the borough of Osset, and in the townships of Horbury, Lofthouse-with-Carlton, Thorpe, Rothwell, Sandal-Magna, Oulton-with-Woodlesford, and in the parishes of Rothwell, East Ardsley, and Outwood, in the West Riding of the county of York; (3) Light railways in the borough of Morley and the urban districts of Birkenshaw, Drighlington, and Gomersal in the West Riding of the county of York; and for other purposes.

II. Amending: (1) The Crowland and District Light Railways Order, 1898; (2) The South Norfolk Light Railway Order, 1898.

MERCANTILE MARINE (SEAMEN EMPLOYED).

Return of the number, ages, ratings, and nationalities of the seamen employed on the 31st day of March, 1901, on vessels registered under Part I. of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in the British Islands.

TRADE UNIONS, BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).

Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade, on trade unions in 1901; with comparative statistics for 1892–1900.

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1902.

Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the Colonies and other Possessions of the United Kingdom.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Treasury minute, dated 10th November 1902, declaring that James Bowden, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Two orders, dated respectively the 7th and 10th days of November, 1902, the former entitled the Bristol (Avonmouth Dock) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902, and the latter revoking three Orders relating to the landing in Great Britain of animals brought from the Channel Islands.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Eleventh general annual report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS ACT, 1888.

Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents' Rules, 1889.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BANKRUPTCY.

Return respecting: laid before the House (pursuant to order of 6th of June last), and to be printed. (No. 186.)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BEXHILL AND ROTHERFIELD RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Read 3^{a}, and passed.

REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF LORDS OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): My Lords, in moving the Motion standing in my name, that Standing Orders Nos. XXXIX. and XLV. be suspended for this day's sitting, perhaps I may be allowed to state, with reference to the Bill to which the Motion relates, that His Majesty has been pleased to approve the appointment of Lord Wolverton to an office in His Majesty's household, and that it has been arranged that my noble friend will take charge of the business of the Board of Trade in this House in the place of the Earl of Dudley, the late Under-Secretary of the Board of Trade.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Standing Orders XXXIX. and XLV. considered (according to Order), and suspended for this day's Sitting.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Moved that the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Thursday the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª (The Lord Wolverton); agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly: Committee negatived. Then (Standing Orders Nos. XXXIX. and XLV. having been suspended) Bill read 3ª, and passed.

LANARKSHIRE (MIDDLE WARD DISTRICT) WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL,

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL,

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, in asking your Lordships to grant a Second Reading to this Bill, I propose, for the sake of lucidity, to divide the few remarks I have to make under two heads—firstly, the necessity for any change in the existing law; and, secondly, the proposals for the changes which are contained in the Bill. With regard to the necessity of some amendment of the Patent Acts, the President of the Board of Trade has long been aware that stringent criticisms have been passed in the country on the existing law, more especially on two grounds—first, that very often a patent granted by the Patent Office is practically valueless, because the Patent Office at the present time has no charge put upon it to inquire into the question of whether the invention that is presented to it has already been patented in that office; and second, that patents have very frequently been taken out by foreigners and others who had no intention whatever of working them in this country, or of granting licences to British manufacturers to use them in this country, and who, in fact, play a dog-in-the-manger policy. The President of the Board of Trade, having these two things in his mind, determined, as is the usual practice, to appoint a Committee to inquire into the whole of the Acts in question. He selected a very strong Committee, over which Sir Edward Fry presided. Among other eminent experts who sat on the Committee was the present Lord Chief Justice of England; and the Bill which is in your Lordships' hands is mainly founded on the Report of that strong Committee.

With regard to the changes proposed to be made in the existing law, put very briefly, they are as follow. There is to be a limited official inquiry into the anticipation of an invention in so far as that anticipation is disclosed by the records of the Patent Office during the period of fifty years preceding the application for the patent; and there is to be a transfer to the Judicial Committee of the powers of the Board of Trade in respect to the granting of compulsory licences. The limited official inquiry will be a great reform in the present patent laws, and will, we hope, give the patentee some security that he has obtained a good patent. I am assured by the Patent Office that, although they anticipate a very large increase in the business of the Department, they will still be self-supporting. I have, I think, said all that needs to be said on Clauses 1 and 2, and I now pass to Clause 3. The President of the Board of Trade has been very much impressed by the representations of very large bodies that have been made to him on the subject of this Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman has been convinced that patents are often taken out by foreigners in this country for obstructing British trade and the development of particular industries, such as the aniline industries in the North. The remedy he proposes is to be found in sub-Section (3) of Clause 3, which, with your Lordships' permission, I will read. It is as follows—

> "Where any such petition is referred by the Board of Trade to the Judicial Committee, and it is proved to the satisfaction of the Judicial Committee that the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to the patented invention have not been satisfied, the Judicial Committee may order the patentee to grant licences on such terms as they may think just, or if the Judicial Committee are of opinion that

the reasonable requirements of the public will not be satisfied by the grant of licences, they may, by order, revoke the patent."

The rest of this Clause has, I believe, been generally approved of by the trading community of the country, and the Clause as a whole will no doubt enable British traders to obtain fair terms from foreign patentees. There is only one other subject of importance in the Bill — namely, the tribunal to which these cases will be referred. I am aware that Sir Edward Fry favoured the High Court as the final Court of Appeal, but in this Bill the President of the Board of Trade has, after due consideration, appointed the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In the presence of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, it would be presumptuous for me to express any opinion upon this. The Bill, which passed through all its stages easily in the other House, has the approval of the trading community, and the Board of Trade feel sure that it will effect a great amendment of the existing law. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, I have only two observations to make on this Bill. In the first place, I wish to point out that it is a complete novelty—I might say a revolution—in the patent law that the question of whether a proposed patent has been anticipated by some earlier specification should be decided by an administrative officer, and not by a judge, with an appeal only to the law officer. It is proposed that the administrative officer—the examiner—shall—

"make investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether the invention claimed has been wholly or in part claimed or described in any previous specification,"

and if he reports to the Comptroller that that is so, the Comptroller may absolutely require the patentee either to amend his patent or to insert a reference to the prior specifications, and the only appeal from the decision of the Comptroller is to the law officer. If, therefore, the Comptroller is of opinion that the proposed patent is anticipated by a prior specification, there will be no means, so far as I can see, of bringing that question—and it is a very important question to the patentee—for decision to the ordinary courts of this country. The other observation I wish to make refers only to a matter of drafting. I observe that in sub-Section 3 of Clause 3, which was read by the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of the Bill, there is a phrase declaring that "the Judicial Committee may order" a patentee to grant licences on such terms as it may think just, and the Judicial Committee is empowered to make other Orders. Your Lordships are aware that the Judicial Committee is only a Committee of the Privy Council. It does not make Orders itself; what it does is to recommend that certain Orders be made by the King in Council. Though it is not a matter of very great substance or importance, I think it would be better that the ordinary procedure, which is for the Committee to "recommend," should be retained. I should be glad to know whether the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack is of the same opinion. I am also informed that the Clause empowering the Judicial Committees to make Rules will require some slight amendment, but as that is purely a drafting matter I will not trouble the House with it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (the Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, with reference to the matter of substance raised by the noble and learned Lord, I think the question has been very fully considered, and I do not propose to go into it. With regard to the point of drafting, I quite agree with my noble and learned friend. I think it has been by an error on the part of the draftsman that the phrase declaring that the Judicial Committee may "order" was used instead of the word "recommend." As the noble and learned Lord has said, the Privy Council makes submission to His Majesty, and then an Order is made in pursuance of His Majesty's command. Therefore I think that when the Bill reaches the Committee stage it should be amended in the sense the noble and learned Lord suggests.

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: the said Amendments to be printed; and to be considered on Thursday next. (No. 187.)

House adjourned at Ten minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 17th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter relating to the Imprisonment of a Member:—

Ennis, Co. Clare,
15th November, 1902.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that Mr. William J. Duffy, Member of Parliament for Galway County (South), has been arrested on a Warrant signed by me, and was on yesterday committed by me to H.M. Prison at Galway to be there detained until the 18th inst., when he is to be brought up at Mountbellew Petty Sessions, County Galway, before a Court constituted under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, to answer to charges of having at Caltra, in the County of Galway, in August last, taken part in a criminal conspiracy and with having incited to conspiracy.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
W. NEWTON BRADY,
Resident Magistrate.

The Right Hon.
The Speaker,
House of Commons.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—

Water Provisional Order Bill,

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill,

Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill,

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill,

Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway (Abandonment) Bill.

Amendments to—

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill [Lords],

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill [Lords],

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill [Lords],

North-West London Railway Bill [Lords],

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, &c.) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Little Woolton; Southampton; and Garston; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Copies presented, of two Orders dated respectively the 7th and 10th November, 1902, the former entitled the Bristol (Avonmouth Dock) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902, and the latter revoking three Orders relative to the landing in Great Britain of animals brought from the Channel Islands [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 10th November, 1902, declaring that James Bowden, Royal Laboratory, War Office Department, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON WATER AREA.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th November; *Mr. Rea*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 374.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2914 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SAMOA (No. 1, 1902).

Copy presented, of Decision given by His Majesty Oscar II., King of Sweden and Norway, as Arbitrator under the Convention signed at Washington, 7th November, 1899, between the German Empire, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the United States of America, relating to the settlement of certain claims on account of Military Operations conducted in Samoa in the year 1899. Given at Stockholm, 14th October, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

South African War—Medals for Transport Officers.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the medal to be given for the conveyance of troops is to be confined to the masters of chartered ships and refused to the masters of mail steamers, which have sometimes carried as many as 2,000 men in a single trip.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The reply to the Question is in the affirmative. The intention is to confine the issue of the medal to troop transports on time charter, which are entirely at the disposal of the Government for service in any direction, and the master and officers of which are for the time being practically the servants of the Crown.

New Zealand Coal for the China Squadron.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can give an analysis of Granity Creek coal as supplied to the China Squadron, *i.e.*, the percentages it contains of fixed carbon, hydro-carbon, water, and ash; and also its evaporative power computed by the multiple most generally used.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) I am unable to give the information asked for in the first part of the hon. Member's Question, as it is not immediately available. It is not considered desirable in the public interest to give the details as to evaporative power.

Education Bill—Position of Attendance Officers.

MR. JOSEPH HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in order to carry out more effectually the Compulsory Clauses of the Education Acts, the Government will assent to the insertion in the Education Bill of a Clause providing that in the case of attendance officers devoting the whole of their time to the enforcing of such Acts they shall only be liable to dismissal from their office with the sanction and approval of the Board of Education.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Such a provision would appear to lie outside the scope of the present Education Bill.

Education Bill—Clause 13—Audit of Municipal Accounts.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, as the House has been deprived by the Order of the House of the 13th instant of the opportunity of considering the provision in Clause 13 of the Education Bill, requiring that the accounts of municipal cities and boroughs shall be made up and audited so far as education accounts are concerned by auditors of the Local Government Board instead of, as in the case of other municipal accounts, by auditors appointed under the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act or special local Acts, he will afford, on the Report Stage of the Bill, an opportunity for considering the objections entertained to the proposal of the Government.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid that no preference can be given to this subject over any other on the

Report Stage; but as the Clause stands early for consideration on Friday, 28th November, it is possible that an opportunity may arise for a discussion upon it.

Non-payment of Rates (Scotland) Return.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkhire, Mid): To ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland will grant the Return which appears on the Paper relative to non-payment of rates.*

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Secretary for Scotland is prepared to grant a Return in continuation of the former Return of 1899, and if the hon. Member can make out a case for the issue of a Return containing the information asked for in Column 3 he will consider it.

Port Ness (Lewis) Harbour.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that Sir John Wolfe Barry, C.E., has declined to visit the Island of Lewis for the purpose of making a report in regard to the condition of the harbour at Port Ness, will the Secretary for Scotland state whether the services of another engineer have yet been secured.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative.

Island of Lewis—Landless Cottars.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate if he will ascertain on what ground the Congested Districts Board are unable to open negotiations with the proprietor of the Island of Lewis for the purpose of acquiring land for cottars, fishermen, and others resident in the island.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I can only refer the hon. Member to my answer to his similar Question on 5th November,† and to the Special Report which is shortly to be issued.

Cable Communication Committee—State Purchase of Cables.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster General whether the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the cable arrangements between Great Britain and all parts of the Empire, ascertained, or endeavoured to ascertain, what revenue was derived from cable messages to and from this country; if so, will he state what is the revenue; and, if not, will he take steps to obtain information as to the amount expended by merchants and all others in this country in cabling messages, with a view to considering the question of purchasing the cables at a fair price.

---

* The Return was as follows;—

"Rates (Non-payment) (Scotland),—Return of the number of Rated Inhabitants in each parish in Scotland whose names were omitted from the Parliamentary Register in the year 1901 in respect of non-payment of Rates, under the heads of (1) relief through inability to pay; (2) failure to pay; and (3) being in receipt of parochial relief, in the following form:—

County.	Parish.	Tenants with rentals under £4.	Number of persons removed from the Parliamentary Register in the year 1901 in respect of non-payment of Rates, under the following heads:—			Total.	Remarks.
			(1) Relief through inability to pay.	(2) Failure to pay.	(3) Being in receipt of parochial relief.		

The Return to indicate the number of tenants in each parish with rentals under £4 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 376, of Session 1899).

† See page 142.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I was not a member of the Committee to which my hon. friend refers, but their Report and Minutes of Evidence have been published as a Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 1056] of 1902. On reference to this Paper my hon. friend will see the scope of their inquiries. The Committee reported strongly against any scheme for the general purchase of cables by the State, and I am not prepared to advise that His Majesty's Government should enter upon such an operation.

Irish Trunk Telephone System.

THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON: (Londonderry): To ask the Postmaster General if he will say how many, and what, towns in Ireland have been connected by the trunk telephone system; whether in all cases the trunk system has been established without any grant from the cities and districts concerned; and, if so, will he explain why the Post Office authorities have required a guarantee of over £500 per annum for the establishment of a trunk telephone from Belfast to Londonderry.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The following thirteen towns in Ireland have been connected with the trunk telephone system: Dublin, Belfast, Balbriggan, Drogheda, Dundalk, Newry, Banbridge, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Wexford, Wicklow, and Arklow. In two cases, namely Newry and Banbridge, the connections have been established under guarantee. An extension to Naas is now being carried out under a guarantee. The ordinary rule in all cases of proposed extensions is to require a guarantee where there is reason to suppose that the revenue will not cover the maintenance and working expenses. When the working of the trunk system was transferred to the Post Office a number of extensions were made in Ireland without guarantee. Experience has shown that none of the Irish trunk lines, except those between Dublin and Belfast, are remunerative, and there is no reason to think that a Belfast-Londonderry line, which would be costly, would be any exception to this rule.

Telegraph Service—Male and Female Clerks.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that at times in the Central Office, London, and in other places, male clerks senior in age and receiving higher pay than the women supervisors are placed under their control; and whether steps will be taken to abolish the practice in accordance with the desire of the Tweedmouth Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Such an arrangement occasionally obtains, especially at times when male telegraphists are voluntarily performing extra duty on sections of circuits which are under the immediate supervision of women; but I am assured that the expressed desire of the Tweedmouth Committee on this subject is duly observed, and that men are placed under the supervision of women as rarely as possible. I may add, as regards the Central Telegraph Office, that female supervisors are themselves under the control of male superintendents and assistant controllers.

British Post Offices at Jerusalem and Peking.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that there are French, Russian, German, and Austrian post offices at Jerusalem and at Peking, and no British post offices at these important places; and whether he will make inquiries as to the business done at those places by British subjects and traders with Great Britain, with a view to opening post offices under England's management.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is the same as was given to him in reply to a similar Question asked on the 5th of May last.† I am aware that the Governments of certain foreign countries have established post offices at Jerusalem and Peking and that there are no British post offices there. Inquiries have already been made whether any exceptional circumstances rendered it advisable to establish a British post office at Peking and I am satisfied that it is not necessary. In the case of Jerusalem I know of no demand for a British post office; and I do not propose to take any steps in that direction.

---

† *See* (4) *Debates*, cvii., 619.

India—Acreage of Cultivated Lands.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is possession of any agricultural statistics which will enable him to compare the acreage of land cultivated in the several provinces of India at the present time with the acreage cultivated in any year subsequent to 1890; and, if so, will he quote the figures.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The cropped acreage for surveyed tracts in the several provinces was returned in 1890–1891 and 1900–1901, respectively, as follows:—

	1890-91.	1900-01.
Burma . . .	7,942,000	11,835,000
Bengal . . .	63,121,000	62,098,000
United Provinces .	42,416,000	42,036,000
Punjab . . .	23,536,000	31,770,000
Bombay and Sindh .	28,701,000	25,468,000
Central Provinces .	16,741,000	16,210,000
Madras . . .	26,096,000	27,850,000
Minor Provinces .	2,365,000	5,276,000

Uganda Railway.

SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that an order was given to an American firm for thirty viaducts for the Uganda Railway in October, 1900, and that it was a condition of the contract that they should be erected complete in forty-six weeks, that is, by September 1901; whether, seeing that the first viaduct was completed by the 31st March, 1901, and seven more by the 31st March, 1902, he can say when the remaining twenty-two will be finished; and whether in future he will insert penalties sufficient to prevent delay in fulfilling contracts.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) An order was given for twenty-seven viaducts in December, 1900, to an American firm which had offered to construct and deliver them in forty-six weeks. The contract provided that actual erection was to be completed within seven months from the date on which the chief engineer should report that he was ready for the contractors to begin work. This he did on the 20th December, 1901, and the viaducts should therefore have been completed by 19th July, 1902. Thirteen of these viaducts have already been taken over from the contractors. Penalties to prevent delay were provided in the contract in the usual manner, but no decision can be come to in regard to enforcing them until the works are finished, and the circumstances under which the delay occurred fully considered.

Naval Ordnance Department—Promotions.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in view of the assurances given, that positions in the Naval Ordnance Department which could be taken by gunners and boatswains as they became vacant should be filled by men of the rank of naval warrant officers, he will explain why none of the ten vacancies for assistant naval ordnance officers that have occurred since 1899, have been filled by the appointment of a naval warrant officer.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The course that has been adopted in regard to the filling of vacancies for assistant naval ordnance officers is in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee which dealt with the reorganisation of the Naval Ordnance Store Department. If the noble Lord will refer to the reply given to his previous Question on this subject, on the 2nd June last,† he will find a statement as to the scope of this Committee's recommendations so far as they dealt with the employment of retired warrant officers.

MSS. Ordnance Survey Memoirs of Ireland.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland where and in whose custody are preserved the MSS. of the Ordnance Survey Memoirs of Ireland; whether, seeing that the only volume printed by the Government was Volume I., relating to the city of Londonderry and parish of Templemore, the Irish Government will consider the advisability of preserving these memoirs by having them printed; or, if the County Councils undertook the same, whether the Government would afford facilities therefor and give a grant in aid thereof.

---

† *See* (4) *Debates*, cviii., 1110.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The MSS. referred to are in the custody of the Royal Irish Academy. The publication, at the expense of the State, of the single volume mentioned, which dealt with one parish only, cost £1,705. The publication of the remaining MSS., of which there are a large number, was not continued, mainly on the ground of expense. I understand they are in excellent preservation and order, are freely accessible to the public, and have been largely utilised in various works bearing on the history and antiquities of Ireland. Any proposals by County Councils in the direction suggested, if made, would be considered by Government.

Historical Relics at Greenan, Londonderry.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what steps have been taken by the Irish Government for the preservation of the ancient buildings on the hill of Greenan, near Londonderry; and, seeing that this historical and ancient monument has been preserved from destruction by the action of a local antiquarian who had the buildings thereon renewed, will he state whether steps will be taken by the Board of Works to have the existing buildings vested in them, and thereby preserve one of the most historic and ancient monuments of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Board of Works is precluded from making any expenditure on ancient monuments unless their custody is vested in the Board by deed. The Department will endeavour to ascertain if the proprietor of the monument in question is prepared to execute such a deed.

Road Labour Scheme for County Limerick.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the lack of employment for agricultural labourers in County Limerick, he will see, now that the Limerick County Council have done their part by direct labour, that the Local Government Board put the scheme in regard to the repairs and maintenance of the public roads into operation as soon as possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) One Rural District Council has appealed against the scheme proposed by the County Council. A local inquiry must in consequence be held before the Local Government Board can sanction the scheme or any modification of it. When the views of the remaining District Councils have been received the inquiry will be arranged for, and no unnecessary delay will be allowed to elapse before the Board gives its decision.

Dungannon Extra Police.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say upon whose authority extra constabulary were drafted into Dungannon on the 5th instant; whether there was any breach of the peace on that date; whether he is aware that the sixty men of the Royal Irish Constabulary only arrived late on the evening of the 5th instant; and will he say upon whom it is proposed to charge the expenses of these additional men, seeing that the opinion of the local authorities that additional police were not required was right; and will he state if there is any precedent for the sending of such a force on that date in previous years.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) An extra force of sixty men was drafted into Dungannon on the 5th instant upon the recommendation of the officers locally responsible for the preservation of the peace. The local magistrates concurred in the opinion that an extra force was necessary; they only differed from the police authorities in their estimates of the number of men required. The occurrences in view of which the force was sent did not take place until the evening of the date mentioned, consequently the men did not arrive until a few hours previously. No breach of the peace occurred, I am happy to say. On two occasions this year rioting took place, when a small force was drafted into Dungannon; on two other occasions, when a large force was brought in, everything passed off peaceably. A force of ten men was sent on 5th November, 1901. A charge amounting to £6 2s. 6d. will be made against the urban district in respect of the men employed on the 5th instant.

Licensing Case at Sneem, Kerry.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mary Doyle, who holds a licence in Sneem, County Kerry, caters for the public, that she has kept no drink on the premises for twelve months, and that the police authorities opposed her licence on those grounds; and, seeing that Mr. Warden, of Derryquin, got an assignment of her licence over twelve months ago, will he say who pays the licence money to the excise authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The police did not oppose this licence, nor is it the fact, as alleged, that Mr. Warden obtained an assignment of the licence. I cannot say by whom the licence duty is paid.

Army—Lodging Allowances for Officers and their Servants at Hong Kong.

Sir JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether any steps have been taken, in view of the representations addressed to him from the General Officer commanding at Hong Kong, in November, 1901, to increase the lodging allowance and allowances for servants granted to officers of the garrison, in view of the house rent and rates of wages charged in the Colony.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The rates of lodging allowance have been increased from the 1st April, 1902. As regards the servants' allowance it was considered that there was no sufficient reason for any increase of rate.

Transport—the "Britannic."

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, can he state the number and composition of the troops embarked on board the "Britannic" from South Africa on 7th July for Australia, and the number for which she was fitted; how many men died on the voyage; and how many have since died in hospital both in Australia and New Zealand.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The figures were as follows:—

	First Class.	Second Class.	Troops.
Accommodation	88	6	1,084
Numbers embarked	85	4	1,002
Composition:—			
Australian Commonwealth Horse	38	—	24
8th New Zealand Contingent	43	4	891
10th New Zealand Contingent	2	—	82
Details	2	—	5

Two deaths took place on the voyage and thirteen on shore from illness contracted on board or in South Africa; five others died from illness developed on shore.

Education Bill—Trust Endowments.

Mr. JOHN HUTTON (Yorkshire, Richmond): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the new Clause with regard to endowments will apply to endowments administered under a Charity Commission scheme; if so, in what way it will affect schools entirely maintained by the endowment, but on the lists of schools supplying elementary education to the district and inspected by His Majesty's inspectors; and how will it affect schools in which the endowments are used partly for elementary and partly for secondary education but which receive the Parliamentary grant.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The new Clause referred to will apply to endowments under schemes in the same manner as to endowments under ordinary trusts. The schools referred to in the second paragraph of the Question would appear not to be public elementary schools, but merely certified efficient schools; such schools will not be affected by the Clause. The answer to the third part of the Question must depend in each case upon the terms of the trust or scheme.

London Traffic and Communication—Proposed Royal Commission.

Mr. BOND (Nottingham, E.) To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of an inquiry being promoted by the Government, by a Royal Commission or otherwise, as to the best means of facilitating traffic and improving the means of communication in London, he would consider the advisability of including in such inquiry the question of obviating, by the provision of subways or otherwise, the necessity of impeding the traffic by breaking up the streets for the purpose of laying and repairing pipes, wires, and sewers.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) In the event of an inquiry being instituted my hon. friend's suggestion will be considered.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Unemployed Reservists.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of unemployed reservists referred to in the letter recently issued by himself and the Commander-in-Chief.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No, Sir; no record of thefigures is available.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: None at all?

MR. BRODRICK: No record is available.

South African War—Honours for War Office Officials.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what number of officers and civil servants connected with the War Office have been rewarded for good service at home in connection with the late war in South Africa, and what form such rewards took.

MR. BRODRICK: The following have been the honours conferred on officers and civil servants connected with the War Office for good service at home during the war—two G.C.B.'s; four K.C.B.'s; sixteen C.B.'s; one Knighthood; one C.M.G. In addition, four clerks have received the Imperial Service Order, and His Majesty has conferred the Victorian Order on eight officials of the War Department during the past two years.

South African Medals.

MR. BUTCHER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that under the existing regulations for the distribution of the Queen's South African medal and the King's South African medal, those officers and men who served during the earlier period of the war will receive but one medal, while those who served for the same time during the later period will receive two medals; whether the effect of these regulations will be to exclude the whole or the greater part of the Colonial troops from the possibility of receiving more than one medal: and, whether under these circumstances, he will reconsider the regulations as to the issue of these medals.

MR. BRODRICK: The regulations for the issue of these medals were only decided upon after very careful consideration of all the interests involved. My hon. friend must recollect that the Colonial troops are not alone in being affected in respect of the dates of service to which the issues apply, and the intention was that regular troops should receive special consideration as compared with those serving for shorter periods at a higher rate of pay. There is no intention of reconsidering the regulation.

Robert Leonard, 6th Dragoons.

MR. GEORGE FABER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he proposes to further investigate the case of Robert Leonard, late sergeant in the 6th Dragoons, who was recently degraded to the ranks, by a sentence of court-martial at York, for having written a letter to the Secretary of State for War, complaining of the harsh way in which recruits in the regiment were treated and making complaints against his squadron commander.

MR. BRODRICK: The General Officer commanding the district was recently instructed to make an investigation into this matter. A Report of the proceedings has not yet reached the War Office.

H.M.S. "Diadem.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the

Admiralty whether the repairs to the boilers of H.M.S. "Diadem" are completed at Glasgow, and when will she be under steam; and can he state the total cost involved in these repairs.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY: (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The repairs to the boilers of H.M.S. "Diadem" are not yet reported as having been completed. The main engines have, however, been under steam in the basin at the contractors' works, and it is expected that a full power trial will be carried out in about ten days time. As the "Diadem" is being repaired on the basis of a schedule of prices, and the work is not yet completed, I am unable at present to give the actual cost.

H.M.S. "Terrible."

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a statement of the repairs required to be done to the boilers of H.M.S. "Terrible" has been sent to the Admiralty; and, if so, whether he will lay the list upon the Table of the House.

MR. PRETYMAN: The list of boiler repairs and alterations which it is considered desirable to carry out in H.M.S. "Terrible" has been received from the dockyard. There is no objection to the list being laid upon the Table if there is any desire that such a course shall be taken.

India—Conduct of 9th Lancers at Sialkote—Indiscriminate Punishment of the Regiment.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to give the House any information with referenc to the reported punishment of the 9th Lancers, now quartered at Sialkote.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The punishment inflicted on the 9th Lancers was (1) recall from leave (other than leave on medical certificate) of all officers and men, and stoppage of all leave until 1st June, 1903; (2) imposition of additional sentry duty while the regiment is in cantonments until 1st June, 1903. It may be well that I should add that I am informed by the Government of India that this punishment was inflicted by them because a native was assaulted and died of his injuries under circumstances which made it reasonably certain that his assailants were men of the 9th Lancers, and because, subsequently, no serious attempt to discover the offenders was made by the regimental authorities, on whom, as well as on the men of the regiment, the responsibility for the failure to bring them to justice is considered by the Government of India to rest.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): May I ask whether that has been done with the full sanction of the officer commanding and the military authorities?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The punishment has been inflicted on the regiment with the full approval of the military authorities.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): Will a full and independent inquiry be made into all the circumstances of the case?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: No, Sir. This is a matter of military discipline with which I do not feel called upon to interfere.

Indian Native Army Colonels.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state why no colonels of the Native Army in India have been promoted to the rank of Major-General since October, 1900.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: By Royal Warrant of 5th November, 1899, it was laid down that "from 1st January, 1901, no promotion shall be made to the rank of Major-General or Lieutenant-General, except by selection, to fill an appointment, or as a reward for distinguished service." From the 1st January, 1901, therefore, promotion by seniority to the rank of Major-General ceased; and the question what Indian appointments should carry that rank is now under consideration by a joint War Office and India Office Committee, whose final report is expected shortly.

Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum.

CAPTAIN NORTON: On behalf of the hon. Member for Pontefract, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the injuries recently inflicted upon an attendant by a patient in Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum; and if he can say whether precautions were taken to ensure the safety of the attendant in question while in the execution of his duty.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have had a Report made to me on this occurrence, and find that for some days previously special precautions had been taken to prevent danger from this particular patient, but that the attendant in question (though specially warned a few hours before the attack) failed to exercise the necessary caution. I am satisfied that very great care is used at Broadmoor to prevent injury being caused by the patients to themselves or their attendants, and the occurrence in question must be regarded as one which no possible care could altogether preclude in an asylum such as Broadmoor.

CAPTAIN NORTON: May I venture to hope that the right hon. Gentleman will see that the special claim of this man to a suitable pension is favourably considered?

[No answer was returned.]

Sunday Trading Prosecutions at Dartmouth.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of convictions and the amount of the fines obtained against Mr. Joseph Scannell, tobacconist, Dartmouth, under the Lord's Day Observance Act of Charles II.; whether the police will be directed to enforce this Act against publicans as well as tobacconists; and, if not, when it is proposed to repeal it.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I have no information which would enable me to answer the first part of this Question. As regards the latter part, it is not a matter in which I feel called upon to issue any directions such as are suggested, even if I had the power to do so, nor can I express any opinion as to the repeal of the Act in question.

MR. TULLY: Why does the right hon. Gentleman refuse to inquire?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The matter is one for the police.

MR. TULLY: And have you no supervision over the local police?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Not in this matter.

Islington Parish Church Bells—Cost of Ringing on King's Birthday.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TUFNELL (Essex, S. E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will explain why the Local Government Board auditor has disallowed the amount paid hitherto for the ringing of the bells of the parish church, Islington, on the King's birthday, which prevented the bells being rung on Sunday, 9th instant; and whether he is aware that the ringing of the bells on this occasion has been done for many generations.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The question which the auditor had to determine was whether this expenditure could legally be defrayed by the Borough Council out of the rates. In his opinion it could not, and hence it was his duty to disallow the charge. He has stated his reasons for the disallowance in the book of account, and it is competent for any person aggrieved by his decision to address an appeal to me against it. The validity of these reasons would then be carefully considered, and if it was found that the disallowance had been lawfully made it would be competent for me to remit it on equitable grounds. I should be quite ready to give favourable consideration to any such appeal.

New Street from Charing Cross to the Mall.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Hunts, as representing the First Commissioner of

Works, if he can state when the new street from Charing Cross to the Mall will be begun, and when it will be open for traffic.

*MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Hunts, Ramsey): The matter is being carefully considered by the First Commissioner, but he is not in a position to make any statement about it at this moment.

Glasgow Corporation and the Clyde.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he will lay upon the Table the Report of Sheriff Jameson upon the application by the Corporation of the City of Glasgow to be constituted the port local authority for the Clyde.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): When the draft Order constituting the port local authority is issued, the Secretary for Scotland will consider the propriety of complying with the hon. Member's suggestion.

Education Bill—Provided Schools.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if the local education authorities will have power to treat as provided schools schools that, originally founded as undenominational schools, have become denominational by the connivance of the trustees.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The denominational or undenominational character of a school does not affect the question of provision. Unless a school is provided by the local education authority it cannot be treated by the authority as a provided school.

Return of Schools Charging Fees.

MR. BATTY LANGLEY (Sheffield, Attercliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will state how many elementary, voluntary, and board schools are now charging fees; what is the annual amount received by Church of England, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, British and other schools, also board schools; and how is the amount received applied

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: According to the latest Returns (1900–1901) the number of schools charging fees was as follows:—Church of England schools, 1,756; Wesleyan, 307; Roman Catholic, 113; British and other, 330; Board, 153; total, 2,659. The amount received from fees was—Church of England schools £121,815; Wesleyan, £29,981; Roman Catholic, £7,163; British and other, £31,161; Board, £41,161; total, £231,281. The amount received in fees is entered in Form 9 and applied to the maintenance of the schools.

Roscommon County and District Council Elections.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Belfast I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if he is aware that at the last elections for county councillors and district councillors in Roscommon a number of county and district councillors who were re-elected without opposition acted as paid presiding officers and poll clerks at contested elections in the same county; and will he state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I am aware that this objectionable practice prevailed at some of the elections in County Roscommon. The question of its legality, which is doubtful, can be raised, I think, either on the audit or by election petition. But I do not at present see what independent action the Executive can take in the matter.

Belfast Winter Assizes.

MR. SLOAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Belfast I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether, in view of the desire expressed by the commercial people of Belfast, Down, and Antrim, that the winter assize should be held in Belfast for criminal business, as at present it generally is, and that a court for trying civil cases and appeals should sit at the same time, he will take steps to establish such a court.

MR. ATKINSON: There is a good deal of difficulty in holding winter assizes permanently (which the suggested change would necessitate) in any particular town, but the matter is under consideration. I cannot, however, give the undertaking asked for.

Longford Registry of Titles.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can state why the Local Registrar of Titles in Longford issued a circular to the tenant purchasers calling on them to re-register their titles; and will the Government defray the cost which this second registration has imposed on the purchasers.

MR. ATKINSON: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. No circular has been issued requiring re-registration, nor has any re-registration taken place. The precise nature and legal effect of what has been done were described by me in a reply to a Question addressed to me by the hon. Member for North Longford on the 5th of July of last year,† to which I beg to refer the hon. Member..

Prosecution of Herbert Lindsay at Belfast.

MR. SLOAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Belfast I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been called to the case of Herbert Lindsay, who was arrested on 9th September last by a sergeant of the Royal Irish Constabulary for an assault; and seeing that, at the trial before the presiding magistrate, the sergeant admitted that he received from Lindsay his name and address and stated he had no reason to doubt his genuineness, and that the presiding magistrate characterised the arrest under the circumstances as an error of judgment, can he take immediate steps to prevent the recurrence of similar cases.

MR. ATKINSON: In this case the complainant was willing and anxious to proceed to the Station House and charge Lindsay with an aggravated assault. The sergeant who, by the way, was himself a Presbyterian, on the information he was then able to obtain, came to the conclusion that the assault was of an aggravated character. Under those circumstances he was, by the provisions of the 229th Section of a Local Act (8 & 9 Vict., cap. 142) justified in arresting the accused and bringing him to the police station. The resident magistrate, on all the facts brought out at the hearing, took a different view as to the nature of the assault, merely observing that it might have been better to have proceeded by summons, but that the best official might be guilty of an error of judgment. The police are fully aware of the rules which should guide them in the discharge of their delicate duties in Belfast. No action by the Executive appears to be called for.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of Herbert Lindsay, who was convicted in Belfast and ordered to pay forty shillings and costs, or in default to be imprisoned for one calendar month for alleged assault; if his attention has been called to the evidence given on appeal at the Belfast Recorder's Court, where the decision of the magistrate was reversed, and will he state on what ground the evidence of character was refused by the stipendiary; will he cause further inquiry to be made in this case; and can he arrange that in future cases of criminal prosecution, where evidence of character is tendered, magistrates will receive such evidence before the determination of a case.

MR. ATKINSON: The evidence given before the Recorder was not the same as that given before the resident magistrate, inasmuch as there was a cross case before the latter, on the hearing of which Lindsay made some important admissions touching his own conduct on the occasion. Evidence of character was tendered, but the resident magistrate said it was unnecessary, as he would assume that Lindsay was a man of excellent character, and that in forcing his way into the house of the complainant, who was a Roman Catholic, and endeavouring to sell to her a work treating of the worship of the Virgin Mary, which was offensive to Roman Catholics, he acted from conscientious motives. The Executive cannot dictate to resident magistrates or other judges how they are to decide cases which come before them. If magistrates fall into error, their mistakes can be corrected by due process of law.

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman take some steps to prevent a man like Lindsay causing disturbances in Belfast by shoving his religious views under people's noses?

---

† See (4) *Debates*, xcvi., 1003.

MR. ATKINSON: Proper steps are taken by the police.

Rock Angus Lights.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will recommend the Irish Lights Board to send an inspector to make local inquiries as to the necessity for lighting Rock Angus at the entrance of Strangford Lough.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights that their Inspector has already visited Rock Angus, and reported to the effect that it is undesirable to light the rock except in connection with an extensive system of leading lights up Lough Strangford.

Irish School Teachers' Salaries.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, the salaries of teachers in Ireland having now been consolidated, there is any objection to their being paid in future monthly instead of, as at present, quarterly.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The present system of quarterly payments necessitates the continuous employment, for a fortnight, of almost the entire staff of the Education Office. Monthly payments would entail a very largely increased staff. On this ground alone the suggestion of my hon. friend could not be adopted.

Inspection of Irish Poor Law Boarded-out Children.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he has received resolutions from several poor law boards refusing permission to the present lady inspector to examine the children boarded out at nurse; and whether he can state when it is proposed to appoint a Roman Catholic lady as an additional inspector, and what will be the conditions of the appointment.

MR. WYNDHAM: On June 26th I stated that the first requisite of a case in favour of appointing a second lady inspectress was that all parties should co-operate to make the first a success. Some resolutions have been received and are to be regretted. But the general attack on the first appointment has ceased, and a second lady inspectress, Miss FitzGerald Kenney, who is, I understand, a Roman Catholic, has been appointed.

Tallow Conspiracy Trial.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the charge of the Lord Chief Baron in the case of O'Keeffe v. Walsh and others, of Tallow, in which certain officials were alleged to have been guilty of a breach of public trust; and if he can state what proceedings he proposes to institute against the officials so referred to.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have read a newspaper report of this important judgment. I respectfully decline to debate the course pursued by the Executive more than three years ago.

MR. TULLY: Why don't you prosecute them?

Irish Court Houses.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many County Councils have refused to vote money for the maintenance of the Assize and Sessions Court-houses; and how many court-houses have, in consequence, been left derelict on the hands of the sheriffs for those counties.

MR. WYNDHAM: One County Council only, namely that of Mayo, recently refused to provide funds for the maintenance of three court-houses within the county. Under the Local Government Act, 1898, it is the duty of the County Council to maintain these buildings in good condition and repair. If the Council fails in its duty in this respect, adequate remedies are provided by the Act. The contingency contemplated in the second part of the Question could never arise.

Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any of the inspectors appointed by the Board of Intermediate Education have any knowledge of Irish; and, if not, whether inspectors who are capable of examining the pupils in Irish will be appointed.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are no inspectors in the service of the Intermediate Education Board.

Irish Land Bill.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to indicate the material points in which his proposals for dealing with the Irish land question will differ from the Bill which he introduced this year.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have nothing to add to the statements I have made in this House and out of it. I believe them to be intelligible, and, in any case, I deprecate a piecemeal anticipation of a First Reading speech.

Irish University Education Commission.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Monaghan, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say when it is expected the Royal Commission on Irish University Education will issue its Report.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am given to understand that the Report will probably be laid before Easter.

Municipal Trading—Suggested Royal Commission.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that the Select Committee of this House on Municipal Trading, appointed on the 6th April, 1900, has not been re-appointed, and in view of the increase in municipal debt and rates occasioned by municipal trading and other causes, he will consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of municipal trading, and into the causes which have resulted in the increase in municipal debt and rates.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I should like to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman accepts the statement twice made in the Question that what is called municipal trading raises the rates; and, if not, whether he approves of such a suggestion in the form of a Question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Really, it is not my business to criticise Questions. I am their victim, and not their critic. Any Gentleman who has any views on that point should address the Chair. As regards the Question put on the Paper by my hon. friend, I have to say that it is, I think, to be regretted that the Joint Committee was not re-appointed, and I hope there will be a possibility of re-appointing it at no distant date. His suggestion for a Royal Commission might be entertained in the absence of the other alternative, but I should not like to give any definite answer to that question without more consideration than I have been able to give to the subject.

MR. LOUGH: May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order to make a statement that municipal trading raises the rates, in the form of a Question?

*MR. SPEAKER: As a rule, argumentative statements of that kind are not admitted in a Question. I have not had my attention called to this Question, or considered its form.

Education Bill—Leased Schools.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will place on the Paper an Amendment to Schedule 4, to include on the repeals Section 24 of the Act of 1870, with a view to carry out his undertaking to preclude in the case of schools which have been transferred to School Boards the retransfer of such schools to the managers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that the general principle which should govern the case referred to by the hon. Gentleman is that which I have already more than once described as applicable to leased schools. If a local authority should voluntarily give up, under its powers, a school which has been transferred to it, I think that case would have to be considered, subject to the provisions of Clause 9. I have already indicated that that is my view with regard to schools which are leased to the authority, and of which the lease has terminated.

*MR. CHANNING: May I draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention to a passage in a speech he made on the 14th July, in which he used very strong words in reply to the appeal made by the hon. Baronet who is now Secretary to the Board of Education to withdraw this Clause——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

*MR. CHANNING: I will put a further Question on the Paper.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us what the business will be on Friday next?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the right hon. Gentleman will kindly repeat the Question tomorrow I shall be prepared to give an answer.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) [GRANTS [14TH NOVEMBER]—REPORT.

Resolution reported: "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of certain annual grants to local education authorities in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to make further provision with respect to education in England and Wales."

(2.45) MR. A. J. BALFOUR suggested that it would be for the convenience of the House that these proposals should not be debated at this stage. On the Clause that was coming on they would be governed in their discussion of these proposals by the Rules of Committee, and not by the more stringent Rules of Report.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he would like to make the observation that it was rather an odd procedure to invite the House of Commons to consider on Monday a Clause which was only put upon the Paper on Friday night, and a proposal which affected so closely not only the interests that the House had to guard, but the interests and concerns of so many local authorities throughout the country.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It would be irregular to discuss the Clause on Report of the Money Resolution.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he was going to conclude by saying that he did not see any objection to the course proposed. He had no desire to do anything that was in the least degree irregular. It was only by way of *obiter dictum* that, while agreeing to the particular course suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, he put in a little protest against the way in which the matter had been laid before the House by the Government.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said there was another complaint they had to make. Perhaps he might be allowed to put it in the form of a Question. They could not thoroughly understand the working of the financial proposals of the Bill without the figures showing the operation of the Bill financially throughout the country. He understood that the Duke of Devonshire had promised to give those figures, and he wished to know why they had not been given to the House. With regard to the appeal which had been made, he thought they ought to have some opportunity of discussing the Clause in its double aspect, and he therefore hoped that any Motion not intended to make nonsense of the Clause would not be too strictly viewed.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that from a purely financial point of view he thought the appeal made by the First Lord of the Treasury was, to say the least of it, somewhat cool. This enormous financial proposal, which in accordance with the invariable Rule of the House had been brought in first in Committee, was closured, and no one had an opportunity of saying a single word about a scheme which he understood involved from one and a half to two millions. Surely it was cool for the right hon. Gentleman to ask the House to forego its undoubted right to discuss this matter. Let it be observed that from a financial point of view this was absolutely the only occasion which the House would have of discussing it. What the House would discuss when they came to the Clause would be the particular circumstances and conditions under which the money already authorised should be handed out. The House was not in such a position that it could dispense with any of the securities with which the wisdom of their predecessors had surrounded their financial operations. It behoved the House to stand up for every power it possessed in connection with the authorisation of any charge upon the public purse. It was extremely unfortunate that the Government had found it necessary to prohibit any discussion on the financial operation of the Bill.

*MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said he wished to attack the principle of the Clause because it contained the element of pure sectarian endowment, which it had hitherto been the policy of the House to avoid. The policy of the Government was to abrogate once for all the principle emphatically laid down in the Act of 1870 that no State money should be given to denominational bodies except under conditions which would make it clear that none of the money should be applied to the cost of religious instruction. That principle was laid down by Mr. Gladstone, and accepted by the Church party, but Parliament was asked to found a new order of lay dogmatic teachers, to be paid entirely by the State. It was said that the Church provided an equivalent in giving the use of its schools. But that was a gift which the Church could not withhold; for, literally, thousands of these schools were built, to the extent of 50 per cent. of the cost, out of State money. The Church had broken down under "the intolerable strain" of maintaining these schools; and now it transferred all the secular obligation to the State, still claiming the right to use the schools for all its own denominational purposes. For all these advantages the Church in return was only to bear the cost of repairs. The Church had got the best of the bargain, and, in some cases, it would make a small pecuniary profit, because the commercial astuteness of the Prime Minister had arranged that the Church was to retain, for denominational purposes, not only the schools, but the teachers' houses, which, under the Act of 1870, were to be taken as part of the school-house, although many of them were partly built at the expense of the State. How did the Prime Minister justify that misappropriation of State money? He should not oppose this grant if it were a grant to secular education only. It was not certain, however, that the funds available for secular education would be increased by the Resolution in its new form. Why should the localities proceed to increase the salaries of the teachers and improve the efficiency of denominational schools? They would be apt to leave these schools where they found them, and not to raise the salaries of men whom they did not appoint and could not control, for the benefit of schools which they were not allowed to manage. There was to be established a new order of lay ecclesiastical teachers. Henceforth the teachers in denominational schools would be ecclesiastical officers, ecclesiastically appointed, and ecclesiastically controlled, performing among their other duties functions which were strictly ecclesiastical; and that system was devised, not because it was necessary to the maintenance of religious education, but for the endowment of religious education. The Bill was only in favour of religious education because it sought to put the religious education of a particular Church on a basis of religious endowment. Contempt was often cast upon the "Nonconformist conscience," but did not the policy the House was now asked to adopt afford a singular illustration of the "Anglican conscience"—at any rate, as that conscience was put forward in Parliament, but not, he believed, as it prevailed among the lay members of the Anglican community. Nonconformist communities, by continuous effort and self-sacrifice, which commanded the greatest possible respect, supported their own ministry and carried on the religious work far beyond the bounds of their own people and churches. The sacrifices made by them for the maintenance of their faith were very real, and often touched personal comforts and even the necessities of life. Those sacrifices were to be increased in order that a far wealthier community might be relieved of a much smaller sacrifice. How were they to be increased? The Church was "coming on the rates!" That phrase was usually held to indicate a rude fall in social status, but he really thought it was not so bad as coming on the bread, sugar, and tea of the poorest of the community. They could now begin to see why the corn tax was imposed. In a time of peace, and with every prospect of a surplus, that tax was imposed as an immediate preliminary to this Bill. Supporters of the measure doubtless regarded these proposals as high State policy, with a fine flavour of religious enthusiasm, but Nonconformists and the people at large—whose affections the Church of England desired to win, but whose taxation was to be increased for the purposes of the Bill—would regard the policy as one of simple meanness. Was that the light in which the Church of England desired to appear either to its Nonconformist brethren or to those whom it wished to win to its fold?

But to pass to another question. A new order of dogmatic teachers to perform really clerical duties was to be founded. Was that what the Church intended? In addition to its other disadvantages, the grant was in direct contravention of one of the most important but most neglected rubrics of the Church. The Prayer Book stated—

> "The curate of every parish should diligently, upon Sundays and Holy days, after the second lesson at Evening Prayer, openly in the church, instruct and examine as many children of his parish sent to him as may be convenient, in some part of the Catechism."

That was how the Church directed its catechetical teaching to be conducted, and it was almost the method adopted by Nonconformists. The latter were content that the basis of morality and religion—common to all Christian sects and forms of faith—should be taught in the State schools, but when an advance was made to the catechetical teaching of specific doctrines, they were not only willing to teach their own children, but insisted on so doing. Nonconformists had no desire to avoid that paramount duty, and the Church of England had no right to get rid of it. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was quite right when he maintained that the proper persons to teach the young of the Church of England were the clergy. What was to be said of the vagaries of the Anglican, or rather the ecclesiastical conscience, which was shocked at the suggestion that laymen should control clergymen in the management of a school, and yet insisted that somebody else should provide the money to enable laymen to do the duty of the clergy?

There had appeared on the Paper, as a Government Amendment, the suggestion that in a school where fees were paid, a part of the fees should be given to the denominational managers towards the cost of religious instruction. That proposal was an evidence of the business-like astuteness of the Prime Minister in the interests of denominational teaching. Why should not that commercial astuteness be devoted in another direction? If the Church was to part with the teaching of its young, and to throw the charge on the State, ought it not to sacrifice some portion of its vast endowments? If the Prime Minister allocated the fees with such precise justice, let him allocate the endowments also. A fair application of that principle would make the right hon. Gentleman a little less eager in his raids on the public purse for the benefit of a particular denomination. Those raids were now made with much apparent success, but the Church of England would probably pay dearly for them. The strength of Nonconformity lay largely in the sense of personal responsibility felt by all Nonconformists in the maintenance of their faith, and that moral quality was shown by results to be worth more, even from the financial point of view, than all the endowments of the Church. The Prime Minister might or might not succeed in his efforts to squeeze out Nonconformity, but he would certainly succeed—although it was not his object—in weakening the sense of personal responsibility in the laity of the Church of England. Every session the right hon. Gentleman came forward with a measure to give further relief. In the long run the Church would probably not thank him for his efforts, and certainly those efforts would meet with the hostility of the people at large, when they understood how the richest branch of the Church of Christ in the world could or would live and do its work only out of taxation, which fell on the poorest of the poor.

(3.14.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn said he had never heard so cool a proposition as my suggestion, that we should not waste our time—"waste," I think, is strictly the word—over the Report stage of this Resolution, but proceed at once to the discussion of the Clause in Committee, under the less rigid Rules which then govern our debates. My hon. friend is a far better judge of coolness than I can pretend to be, and if, after consideration, that is his verdict, I do not intend to defend myself against the charge. But I would point out to the Committee that, if my hon. friend's objection was simply regard for the public purse and to secure a strictly financial debate on the Report of the financial Resolution, he must have been singularly disappointed by the speech to which we have just listened. The hon. and learned Member told us of a great many things. He told us of the demerits of the Church of England, the demerits of the First Lord of the Treasury, and the demerits of the Bill at large, but they have really nothing to do with the financial proposals of the Bill considered as financial proposals. When I listened to the hon. and learned Member's speech, I confess that I could not feel in my heart to blame him, because I felt that this must have been some belated specimen of a Second Reading speech which the unfortunate accidents of debate had prevented him delivering earlier. The hon. and learned Member has told us that this Bill is an extraordinary and a generous gift to the Church of England, and he has told us that in so far as it relieves the ratepayer, it relieves him of a charge which he ought to bear. I am glad he has made that statement, because I find that some of my friends think this proposal very hard upon them. The hon. and learned Member has treated this Resolution throughout as if it referred to a contribution from the taxpayer to denominational education and to denominational schools. It is nothing of the kind. It is a contribution to the general education of the country, which affects provided schools as much as unprovided, and which affects unprovided as much as provided schools, and for the hon. and learned Member to come down here and talk about it as if it was a contribution from the poorest of the poor, is to make a travesty of the facts which I am surprised at coming from an hon. Member holding the position which he does in this House, and I am surprised that he should have condescended to this. The hon. and learned Member was not only wholly and utterly inaccurate in his conclusions, but he was absolutely inaccurate as to the principle which underlies this proposal. He said that it was a new principle, and that for the first time we are breaking through an old and well-established canon that there should not be any contribution from public funds to denominational education. The hon. and learned Member must have known that he was talking something nearly approaching to nonsense when he made that statement. He must know that the State has constantly contributed to denominational teaching, both in England and Scotland, and he must know perfectly well that whatever may be said about the novelty of giving rate-aid in England, however novel that principle may be, there is absolutely no novelty whatever in the principle of giving money out of the Exchequer towards schools in which denominational teaching takes place.

MR. ROBSON: I never, of course, said it was a novel principle for the State to give money to schools in which there was denominational teaching. What I said was that in giving that money the State had always taken care that no part of the money should be allocated to the cost of religious teaching. That was the principle which I laid down.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. and learned Gentleman is quite wrong, and it is perfectly easy to show that no public money goes to denominational teaching in those schools now. It is only a question of going through the accounts of the schools. I venture to say that the hon. and learned Member's theoretical principle is as much preserved, if it ever had any existence, under this Bill as it was before. This Resolution deals with a contribution which is a contribution by the Exchequer, not to one class but to all classes of schools, or, more correctly speaking, it is a contribution from the Exchequer not to schools at all of any sort or kind or distinction, but to the ratepayers upon whom rests the obligation of providing schools. If the House agrees with my contention, they will draw, as I do, two conclusions. One is that the hon. and learned Member's speech was irrelevant from beginning to end, and the other that the sooner we get into Committee upon the Clause the better. I do not know what the promise of the Duke of Devonshire refers to, but I do not think it is possible to give the figures yet, and there must be an element of conjecture about them.

*Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that although he approved the amalgamation of the two grants of 1897, a suggestion which he himself had made, he most cordially supported the general contention of his hon. and learned friend who had just spoken. He traversed the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury that the speech of the Member for South Shields was in any sense irrelevant to the financial issues raised by the Resolution. The whole of his speech was based upon the provision of public money and its expenditure upon the objects proposed, and upon both those points he thought his hon. and learned friend had established an unanswerable case for the criticism he had levelled against the Bill. They perfectly recognised the purpose and the policy of this Bill. Step by step in the course of the Committee on this Bill concession after concession had been made to the denominational interests, and no protection was given to the public, no guarantee was given that these grants would be expended in the way the nation had a right to demand, namely, in the development of secular education. There was nothing to restrain sectarian bodies in their efforts to divert these grants and use them for sectarian ends. This half million of money would go to support the machinery placed in the hands of the denominationalists to capture and monopolise the schools of the country. That was one aspect of this grant. It was an enormous subvention to sectarianism. And the other aspect was equally characteristic of the uniform policy of this Ministry. The question of rates was ultimately a landlord's question. And this money was being given in a way which inevitably made it a new subvention to the landowners. He protested against this grant because there was no guarantee given to the public that this money would be spent upon popular education. They had been giving subsidy after subsidy in the teacher's house, in the share of endowments, and in other ways. They had learned finally today that even in the case of denominational school managers who had not had the pluck, and would not make the pecuniary sacrifices, to keep their schools going in the past, and who had, in consequence, transferred them to the School Boards to run. These extra funds would now be handed over to enable them to take over their schools and turn them into denominational schools again.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said this proposal had only been on the Paper for a few hours, and he wished to know if an opportunity would be given them of discussing the general bearings of the Clause.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) asked if they would be able to discuss in Committee whether part of the grant ought not to be given to secondary education.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was loth to answer what was apparently a question of order, but he should greatly doubt whether it was possible to dismiss secondary education. That was not, however, for him to decide. As to the question of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, that must depend upon the character of the Amendment. He thought they must treat the whole Clause as a discussable proposition. On the other hand, the Amendment might be of a character which would enable other Amendments to be brought before the Committee.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he would reserve anything he desired to say on the proposed grant for the Committee stage, but he wished to ask a question which he thought could be more suitably answered now than in Committee. It had reference to the position of London in connection with this matter. London was for the moment left out of the Bill, and the House could not say at present whether the Government intended to deal with it next year. Assuming that the Bill applied to London, then London, in the ordinary course, would be entitled under the new proposal to £195,000 out of the total grant. Deducting the £49,000 which the voluntary schools received under the voluntary schools grant — he was using round figures, which he thought were sufficient for his purpose—London would be entitled to £146,000 out of the round £1,000,000 proposed as the additional sum to be given under the Bill. It appeared to him that a sum of £146,000 ought to be put aside in respect of London. Obviously it would not be fair that London taxpayers should contribute this additional sum unless London schools were to benefit to the same extent as they would do if the Bill applied to London. According to the ordinary calculation, London contributed one-fifth of the whole sum of the Imperial taxation, and therefore the amount to which the London taxpayers were entitled was something like £200,000. The Prime Minister had said that the question of Ireland and Scotland would be reserved, but that these countries would not in any sense be damnified by this Bill passing and by an additional sum being given to England. How would London stand in this matter? It seemed to him that the only way of dealing with the matter was to earmark £150,000 for the benefit of London education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The provisions of this Bill, as the hon. Gentleman knows, do not refer to London. We hope to deal with London on an early day, but I do not see how we can allocate money to London until we deal with it.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he did not mean that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Or accumulate it.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that until London was dealt with, London would be mulcted to the extent he had indicated.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he understood his hon. and learned friend the Member for South Shields would oppose the grant if a division were taken. He understood that his hon. friend the Member for East Northamptonshire was in the same position. He therefore wished to state the reason why he would support this grant in aid. If he had come to the House and heard the speech of the hon. and learned Member for South Shields without any knowledge of the question, he should probably have been influenced by his arguments. But what were the sober facts of the case? This was a grant in aid of local rates. It was a grant in aid of the provided schools, just as much as a grant in aid of the non-provided schools. If his hon. and learned friend had moved to reduce the amount by what went to the non-provided schools, there would have been something to say for the proposal. He was perfectly ready to oppose any further grants in aid being given to the denominational schools where there was not popular control, but this was not a grant to the denominational schools, because these schools would receive the grant in one way or another, or rather, he ought to say, they would receive the money from the taxes in one way or another, whether there was any grant or not. The only effect of refusing this grant in aid would be that the denominational schools would receive a larger sum out of the local rates, and the provided schools would receive more out of the Imperial Exchequer. Were they prepared to refuse this grant in aid, and even the increase that had been made, and at the same time to say that the local rates should be increased in proportion? That was quite right, undoubtedly, from the point of view of the hon. Member who represented one of the Divisions of London. He represented a great many who paid no rates at all, the voluntary subscriptions having been so liberal that no local rates had been required. He did not think the view stated by the hon. Member for North Camberwell was that which was generally taken by Members of the House. It was perfectly true that the financial proposals gave a little more than was contemplated, until last week. It was, however, limited indeed, and there was this objection to the limitation that they laid down the principle that the local rate for primary education should never be less than 3d. in the £, and if, by good management and economy, combined with efficiency, those local rates should be under 3d. in the £, the Imperial Exchequer grant would at once be reduced by the same amount. That appeared to him to be an unsatisfactory form. It was encouraging people in the local districts to economise the amount of grant voted from the Imperial Exchequer. At the same time it ought to be borne in mind that this grant was only for primary education, and that an amount would have to be raised for secondary education. It was now suggested that the rate for that purpose should be 2d. The whisky money had been applied in the past in many cases entirely to secondary education. The Government were really putting on the local ratepayers this compulsory rate of 3d., and at the same time there was another equivalent rate of 3d. The result would be that the local ratepayers would have to contribute 6d. in the £ for educational purposes in their district. He did not argue entirely from the point of view of the agriculturist. He believed the local rates pressed heavily in country towns and villages on the small shopkeepers and tradesmen and the agricultural labourers, and it was in behalf of those men that he supported the grant in aid.

(3.42.) MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he wished to refer to the point raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, and to ask the Committee to consider how they stood from the point of view of procedure. Here they were asked to pass the Report stage of the Resolution, authorising the Chancellor of the Exchequer to pay certain large sums of money out of the Treasury, and neither the Prime Minister nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer had told the Committee, even in an estimate, what was the total sum of money the Resolution was to authorise payment of. The Committee stage of the Resolution was closured on Friday afternoon. As he read the Resolution, it was an indefinite sum that was to be paid out of the Exchequer. It seemed to him they had arrived at a stage when the Treasury was to be considered as a sort of private box of the Ministry of the day, instead of as the public purse to be directly guarded by this House. He doubted if there ever was an occasion throughout the history of the House when there was a Resolution undiscussed in Committee or unexplained on the Report stage by a Minister of the Crown, and by which it was proposed to authorise large sums of money to be paid out of the Treasury, without any estimate in round figures being placed before the House. He should have liked to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his place at present. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman, as guardian of the Treasury, would not remain dumb to the end of the Report stage. The position was even more striking for this reason, that the Resolution which stood on the Paper for many weeks until Friday last, was a Resolution which had been drawn up in consultation with the then Chancellor of the Exchequer. They were informed by the Prime Minister that it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day that had insisted on the precaution being taken that the grant from the Treasury should not exceed three-fourths of the expenditure on education. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer in doing that was taking a very effectual safeguard over the National funds, but in a moment that safeguard had disappeared. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would tell the House what he thought of this unlimited Resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR formally moved—

"In page 4, after Clause 10, to insert the following Clause:—'(1) In lieu of the grants under. The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, and under Section 97 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, as amended by The Elementary Education Act, 1897, there shall be annually paid to every local education authority, out of moneys provided by Parliament—(*a*) a sum equal to 4s. per scholar; and (*b*) an additional sum of 1½d. per scholar for every complete 2d. by which the amount which would be produced by a 1d. rate on the area of the authority falls short of 10s. a scholar. But the total amount of Parliamentary grants paid to a local education authority in any year shall not be such as to make the amount payable out of rates by the local education authority in respect of their expenses under Part III. of this Act in that year less than the amount which would be produced by a rate of 3d. in the pound, and the grants shall, if necessary, be reduced accordingly. (2) For the purposes of this section the number of scholars shall be taken to be the number of scholars in average attendance, as computed by the Board of Education, in public elementary schools maintained by the authority.'"

He said: I do not think that it will be necessary for me to make any long statement in explanation of the altered Clause. There are, broadly speaking, two changes. The one consists of a considerable increase in the amount which is given by the Exchequer; the other is a change—not of vital or fundamental importance, but still a useful change—in the mode in which the money is allocated. I have already made a statement as to the advantages of dividing the money into two portions, one giving a fixed sum per child of the population of the whole kingdom, and the other making allocations to different portions of the kingdom, on a basis varying with the wealth or poverty of the various districts concerned. I, on that subject, will only say that we have maintained that basis unaltered, except that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has found it possible to increase the sum which the Government estimated as a maximum of somewhere about £900,000 a year. Roughly, we have been able to add to that a sum which, if every locality complies with the conditions under which the grant can be conferred upon them, will amount to about £400,000 a year more, so that there will be a total benefit to the local ratepayers of about £1,300,000 a year. That is the largest change in the Clause, and I think it is one which will be universally satisfactory. The other change refers to the limitation based on the 3d rate, and I think that will also prove satisfactory on the whole. The Government thought at first that a 3d. rate would be universal, or nearly universal; but, on closer examination, we found that there were more places than we supposed in which it will not be necessary to raise a 3d. rate. No blame attaches to the Government for that miscalculation, and no inconvenience has been caused to the Committee. I shall accordingly ask the Committee to consider a further Amendment. The general proposition I wish to advance is this: that under the Clause as it now stands we give a larger sum than we gave before, and also render the limitation principle more generous in its operation.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: (Carnarvon Boroughs): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to read the exact terms of the modification.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My explanation is probably simpler than the terms of the Amendment. It is this; if any place raises less than a 3d. rate, its grant from the Exchequer will be *pro tanto* diminished. The Amendment, however, will be to strike out the paragraph beginning "But the total amount" and ending "be reduced accordingly" and to substitute the following, "If in any year the total amount of Parliamentary grants payable to the local education authority, would make the amount payable out of other sources by that authority, on account of their expenses under Part III. of this Act, less than the amount which would be produced by a rate of 3d. in the £, the Parliamentary grant shall be decreased and the amount payable out of other sources shall be increased by a sum equal in each case to half the difference."

New Clause (Aid Grant)—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*)—brought up and read a first time

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

*(3.55.) SIR CHARLES DILKE thought it most unfortunte that they had these continual changes in the Clauses of the Bill. Only hon. Members who were members of local authorities were competent to discuss this new Clause, and what was wanted was time to send it down to the various local authorities in order to hear from them how it would work out. Those of them who had tried to get at the facts knew that there was a great difference of opinion amongst highly competent authorities as to how the Clause would work out. Amendments which some of his hon. friends proposed to this Clause were based on the fact that it gave very sufficient financial assistance to different

parishes, and discrepancies between district and district would continue to exist. They might not be so extreme as between the highest and the lowest as at the present time, but they would continue. Many hon. Members desired to see the principle of the equalisation of rates, which had been put forward for London by the Government with every demonstration of support from their followers, applied to the counties. Something was done in 1897 to redress the grievance by the grants to the most necessitous districts, but the Act making these grants would be repealed by the present Bill, and the hardship would remain. Calculations which had been made by those who had the greatest official knowledge of the figures, showed that, while the effect on the general rate of the county that would be produced by equalisation within the county would be very small, the discrepancy as between different districts would be very great, some districts paying three times and four times as much as others. To relieve the poorer districts, the average charge would be very small, as compared with the enormous discrepancy as between district and district. The Committee would have to consider that matter. No doubt, the case of county boroughs which were extremely necessitous would be put before the Committee; but the question of equalisation within the counties, in order to relieve the poorer parishes, which had lost the local management of their education, should also be considered. The Government had given, in respect of the poverty of those poor districts, a large sum of money; but they had given half of it absolutely to the county as a whole, and the county was given discretion as to whether half the other half, or another quarter, should be given to the poor districts. Why should the county have that invidious task put upon it? It seemed to him that a larger share should be given to the poor districts, and that there should be some attempt at equalisation. The hon. Member for the South Molton Division put a Question to the First Lord of the Treasury on the subject the other day. The hon. Member asked if the expenses charged to the present School Board areas would be included in the expenses of the local education authority; and it was an extraordinary fact that the answer was in the affirmative. That brought out the absurdity of the situation. The proposal was one that would not stand the careful investigation of the Committee.

DR. MACNAMARA said he quite admitted that the problem of how to meet the case of the poorer districts equitably was a very difficult one. Where the rateable value was lowest, the number of working class children to be educated was, as a rule, highest, and where the rateable value was highest, the number of working class children to be educated was, as a rule, lowest. That being so, the difficulty of meeting the case of the poorer districts was very great. For instance, in Bournemouth the rateable value was £390,000, the number of children to be educated was 3,400, and 1d. in the £ brought in 9s. per child. In Gateshead, on the other hand, the rateable value was £340,000, the number of children to be educated was 14,240, and 1d. in the £ brought in 1s. 7d. per child. To devise a sliding scale which would meet two extremes of that kind was a very difficult task. How did the Government propose to meet them? They took all the Voluntary School Acts' money, except what belonged to London, which was not yet legislated for, and also the necessitous School Boards' money, amounting in all to £860,000. Then they added the new £900,000 described to the House by the Prime Minister, making a total of £1,760,000. First of all, they proposed to dispense 4s. per child all round; and, including London, that worked out at £824,600, leaving £935,400. Then they proposed a 1½d. sliding scale for every complete 2d. by which the amount which would be produced by a 1d. rate on the area of the authority fell short of 10s. a scholar. Their original proposal was a 1d. sliding scale; and the increase of a ½d. would increase the amount by £467,700, making a total of £2,227,700, of which £824,600 would be in the form of a fixed 4s. per child, and £1,403,100 in the form of a 1½d. sliding scale. He did not think that that was the best plan of dispensing the money. The fixed portion was too much, and the sliding scale portion was not enough. If the fixed portion were materially diminished, and the sliding scale portion increased, the money could be dispensed in such a way as to make it better for the poorer districts, and not quite so good for the richer districts. He himself had taken the trouble to work out the figures for every part of the country; and he would direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the solution he proposed. If the fixed portion were reduced to 2s., there would then be sufficient money to make the sliding scale, not 1½d. but 2d. A 2s. fixed portion would amount to £412,300, leaving a balance of £1,815,400 to be dispensed under the 2d. scale. He would take the two most extreme cases. In the case where a 1d. in the £ only brought in 1s. per child, under the Government scheme, such a district would get a fixed grant of 4s. a child, and under the 1½d. scale it would get 6s. 9d. or a total of 10s. 9d. The other extreme limit was where 1d. in the £ brought in 10s. a child. In that case, the fixed grant of 4s. would be paid, but nothing would be paid under the sliding scale. That was a difference between the two cases of 6s. 9d., but the difference in the 1d. rate was 9s. and accordingly 6s. 9d. would not meet the differentiation. His proposal would involve exactly the same amount of money. In the case where the 1d. produced only 1s. a child, 2s. would be paid as the fixed grant, and 9s. under the 2d. sliding scale or a total of 11s. In the other case, where a 1d. rate produced 10s. per child, the fixed grant of 2s. would only be paid, and nothing would be given under the sliding scale; and the total would be 2s. and 9s., the difference between the product of the 1d. rate in both cases. The net result would be that by narrowing down the fixed portion and increasing the sliding scale, the same amount of money would be spent, viz. £2,227,700, but a little would be taken off the richer districts and put on the poorer districts. Curiously enough, the special aid grant would be exactly the difference between what a 1d. rate would produce in the different districts. He would suggest to the First Lord of the Treasury that that would be a more equitable scheme. The Government scheme was a good scheme as far as it went; but it made the fixed grant too much, and the sliding scale not wide enough to provide for the extreme differentiation in the amount produced by the 1d. rate. All the intermediate cases between a 1d. rate producing 1s. and 10s. would work out similarly under his scheme. He apologised for dealing with the matter in detail, but it was desirable that they should arrive at some scheme under which the money could be spent in such a way as to equitably deal with the great differentiation in rateable values. The new proposal with reference to the 3d. rate was, in his opinion, an improvement on the rigidity of the original scheme. He agreed that an obligation should be put on the locality to pay something. Indeed, he regarded that as vital; not that he wished to see more rates raised, but because he wanted people who had contracted themselves out for thirty-two years, largely because of the preference they said they had for a particular form of religious instruction, to be made to pay something. He was glad the Government had the courage to impose a local obligation to pay something. Otherwise, he had not the shadow of a doubt that towns like Preston, Stockport, and St. Helens would at once say, "We are going to get this new special aid grant; our schools are not so bad after all; we will be much better off; and there will be no need for us to raise a local rate at all." He was more glad than he could express that the Government had insisted in putting on a local obligation. But, modified though it was, the 3d. rate was more or less arbitrary. For instance, in Bournemouth a 3d. rate would raise 25s. a child, whereas in Stockport it would only raise 6s. a child, owing to the higher rateable value and the smaller number of working class children in the former as compared with the latter district. But Bournemouth must raise 25s. per child, otherwise it would be fined, even under the modified scheme. The scheme did not say that a 3d. rate should be raised, but that, if it were not raised, the locality would be fined to an amount representing the difference between a 3d. rate, and the rate they did raise. It was almost impossible to fix a standard of local obligation which would not be arbitrary in its incidence. The higher the rateable value, the smaller would be the number of working class children, and the lower the rateable value, the larger would be the number of working class children. Therefore, the 3d. rate, modified as proposed, would be more or less an arbitrary standard. He did not like the phrase of 3d. in the £ in all new cases. because there was a grave danger that it would be stereotyped as the educational maximum instead of the minimum the Government intended it to be. The eight county boroughs and the 250 non-county boroughs which had never had a rate would say "3d. is the amount we are to go to, and we will go to that but no farther." He did not wish it to become fixed as the statutory maximum, which would be a most disastrous thing. In regard to the distribution of any new special aid grant, the Government should narrow the fixed portion and widen the sliding scale. While he was glad that the Government would insist upon there being a local obligation, he should be sorry to find it fixed in the Bill at 3d. in the £. He would rather have had a proportionate grant and a widening of the sliding scale. He would rather see it put down at three-fourths by the State and one-fourth by the locality.

(4.20.) Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) thanked the Government, on behalf of those who desired a charge on the rates that would not be unduly burdensome, for the concession they had made. It would be a monstrous thing to attempt in this Bill to fine in the future the districts which had hitherto been under a purely voluntary system. Although he agreed that the ratepayers must bear a fair share of the burden, when it came to the question of what that fair share was, there was no reason for making the burden heavier than was necessary to obtain an efficient system of education. Anything beyond that was harmful, and made the ratepayers dislike education. The proposal of the hon. Member for North Camberwell to reduce the grant to 2s. per head and widen the sliding scale, would not specially favour the extremely poor districts. It would put aside certain advantages which the voluntary districts had had, and which ought not to be taken away from them in the future. It would place a fine upon those districts which had a voluntary system, and be exceedingly hard on the county districts in which there was a mixed system. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had talked about an equalisation of rates up to the old School Board standard. This Bill took the burdens off particular districts and put them on the county at large, but beyond that the right hon. Gentleman desired the equalisation of rates between county and county.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE said that what he desired was equalisation of the rates, not as between county and county, but within the county itself

Mr. CRIPPS was glad the right hon. Baronet did not desire equalisation as between county and county, as that was really a monstrous proposal and one which ought never to be made. As regarded the 3d. rate, under the Clause as it originally appeared, it was to be levied in every district whether it was wanted or not. That would have been not only very unfair, but tremendously wasteful. Districts in which, because the educational necessities were met from either voluntary sources, endowments, or State grants, the money was not required, would have been obliged to levy this 3d. rate. That was an impossible position to take up. However, the Government had now altered their proposal. But even under the altered circumstances, he thought the rates ought not to be called on. He could not see why a district, which had sufficient money for educational purposes, should be obliged to raise a rate in order to get a grant to which they were otherwise entitled. He had no objection on principle when it was a question of the division of the amount between the State grant and the rates. In the present form of the proposal the Government had done all they could have been expected to do, and he heartily thanked the Prime Minister for the concession he had made.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that as a general principle he was opposed to grants-in-aid, but the one under discussion was of a much better character than any the Government had proposed during the last six years inasmuch as it did not differentiate between classes of people or classes of schools. Moveover, if there were to be grants-in-aid at all, those for educational purposes were the most justifiable. It was all very well for the hon. Member for North Camberwell to attack poor little rural districts because they did not contribute much to the rates, but seeing what a hard struggle it was for the little tradesmen to scrape a living and for others to raise their rent, it was really a matter of surprise that they levied any rates whatever for educational purposes or anything else that they could avoid, and any provision that would lighten the burden of rates upon them would be an advantage to education itself. The Welsh School Boards had been severely criticised. No doubt the attendance compared unfavourably with that in some of the rich English boroughs, and the equipment and staff were inferior, but the reason was given in the very figures quoted by the hon. Member, because they proved that even that poor equipment cost more proportionately than that in the richer boroughs. The difficulty was one of rating, and, much as he loathed grants in aid, he was glad the Prime Minister had introduced this proposal; in his opinion it would be the least objectionable Clause in the Bill. The difficulty was not so much equalisation between county and county, or town and town, as equalisation within the county itself. The cost of a building, ordered by the Board of Education, even though inefficiently equipped, was prohibitive to a poor parish. Could not the Prime Minister find some means of meeting such cases? If the right hon. Gentleman would provide that out of the subvention the County Council should make a grant in aid of buildings, it would be a considerable relief to the poor parishes, and would hardly hit the county at all. It would probably represent less than ½d. rate to the county, but it meant a difference of 1s. or perhaps 1s. 6d. to the parish. Seeing that the Necessitous School Boards Act was being repealed, these places would not get so much relief after all; therefore he hoped some distinction would be made in favour of the poor little parishes.

*SIR H. MEYSEY - THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth) said that as the question of Mr. Forster's opinion had been raised, he rose for the purpose, not of discussing the proper rate that should be levied, but of stating what he heard Mr. Forster himself say on the point. At the time of the Education Bill of thirty years ago he went with his father, who took a very great interest in the question of education, to stay at a house in Yorkshire, where they met Mr. Forster. The whole question of the Bill was discussed, and Mr. Forster was asked the question: "Why do you not fix a limit to the rate?" to which he replied: "Well, I nearly decided to put a limit of 4d.; the reason I did not do it was that I thought, if the limit was put in, every education authority would think it necessary to spend the 4d., whereas I think it ought to be done easily for 2d. or 3d."

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) asked whether the basis on which the assessment would be made would be the county basis or that of the particular area under the local education authority.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): It is the county basis.

MR. M'KENNA: I think the words ought to be in the Clause.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: They are not wanted.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, N.) expressed his great regret that the House should have to discuss this intricate question without the benefit of the views of the local authorities on the matter. The Government had pursued a most extraordinary course. In June last the First Lord of the Treasury announced this new Clause; it was tabled some time afterwards, but it was not until Friday morning last the present form of the Clause was published, while that very afternoon an alteration had been made, which the Members would have to discuss from their recollection of its object rather than their knowledge of its terms. A more inconvenient or unfortunate course could not be imagined. The complaints as to the heavy burden the Bill would throw on the rates were made before the Second Reading of the measure. The Government, therefore, had had all the facts before them for some months, and why they should have waited until now to mature their plans passed comprehension. On that side they held very strongly that the Committee had not been properly treated in the matter, and he felt bound to voice that feeling.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

*(4.45.) MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) moved the omission of the words "under Section 97 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, as amended by The Elementary Education Act, 1897." He was anxious to state the case in which certain necessitous School Board districts were very much interested, and he wished to suggest a rearrangement of the grants proposed by this Clause. He recognised that if the sole result of this Amendment meant an increase of taxation he should be out of order, but the consequence of the Amendment he moved would be to cause a rearrangement of the last part of the Clause. He thought he would be able to show the Committee that the right hon. Gentleman had not submitted a scheme which would carry out the intentions already expressed by the Government. He would try to state his case as shortly as he possibly could. In 1870 it was recognised that the imposition of a rate for educational purposes would inflict upon certain districts an exceptionally heavy burden, and the Act of 1870 tried to make provision to meet the necessities of those places. It provided that in those districts if the 3d. rate did not produce a sum equal to 7s. 6d. per child in average attendance, such district would be entitled to an additional grant to bring up that sum to 7s. 6d. That system existed for twenty-seven years. But in 1896 the terrible condition in which certain urban and rural districts had been placed by the increased demands of the State, caused the position to be brought before Parliament, and this resulted in an alteration of the law in 1897. In 1897 they passed the Necessitous School Boards Act, under which an attempt—and a very earnest and successful attempt—was made to deal with certain exceptionally heavily rated districts. The Government of that day tried to find—and he thought did find—a very clear definition of what constituted necessity with regard to the School Board rate. They laid down that it should depend upon three factors; (1) the rateable value of the district; (2) the number of children to be educated; and (3) the amount of rate which had to be levied locally in order to discharge the statutory obligation. He wanted to lay stress upon the third factor. It was then agreed that they could not accurately define "necessity" unless they kept in mind in addition to the rateable value the amount of the rate which was to be levied in the district. If one district was entirely supplied by voluntary schools transferred to the new authority, though its rateable value and child population might be exactly the same as another district which had to supply all its schools, the charge which would accrue in the second case would be much higher than the other. It had already been pointed out that in order to deal adequately with such cases some grant must be made not only towards maintenance but to the cost of the buildings. In the Act of 1897 the cost of the buildings was carefully considered, and he needed only to quote the opinion which had been arrived at by the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, written by Lord Balfour of Burleigh himself, which stated that in the Act of 1897 an exceedingly ingenious and effective scheme had been discovered of dealing with this necessity. Only five years ago this principle was adopted, and now, under this Bill it was to be entirely thrown aside although it had worked well for five years and had the most cordial support of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. And why? As far as he could understand because the Government were of the opinion that the present scheme met the necessity, or else because they thought it was difficult to find an adequate remedy. In 1896 the difficulty

was declared to be insuperable, but in 1897 it was overcome. He was not suggesting that they should revert to the Bill of 1897, but that the same principle should be incorporated in this Bill. What would be the effect of this scheme throughout the country? The scheme of the Government recognised two factors only, child population and rateable value, and upon those two factors alone would the new grant be distributed. Everyone realised that under the new Government scheme the 4s. per child would be distributed irrespective of the wealth or poverty of the district. Then they came to the sliding scale, which depended entirely upon the rateable value and the child population. If every district were equally supplied with school buildings, there would be much to be said for this scheme, but when they realised that in some districts every school required was at present a charge upon the local rates and would remain so for some time, that the rateable value was low and the child population was very high, they had the whole of those three factors in the most aggravated form, and nothing was being done by the Government to meet these special cases. Those districts would not be one whit better off. He was more particularly interested in the great county borough of West Ham, with a population of nearly 300,000, and its enormous number of children, the majority of them being educated in board schools, and with the prospect of having to take over more than 7,000 children now in the voluntary schools. He had often brought before the House the disastrous taxation already pressing upon that borough. West Ham was a town larger than Nottingham, and with a larger child population, and it had a school rate which Nottingham would tremble at the very prospect of. The School Board rate in West Ham was 2s. 6½d., although they received, under the Act of 1897 the sum of about £18,000 a year. The Government proposed to sweep away that money under the lines he was moving to omit, and in lieu thereof they proposed to give another grant. The other grant, however, did nothing more nor less than take the place of that money, but under the amended form of the Government proposal there would be added a sum of about £4,800, and that was all. That sum would only grant the smallest possible relief to the very heavy charge which would have to be undertaken in the education of those 7,000 additional children in the voluntary schools. How were they left as compared with other towns not necessitous? Bath would escape with a 5½d. rate. The figures he was quoting were based upon the latest Departmental Returns, and if they were inaccurate the margin of inaccuracy would remain the same throughout the whole of the towns. Bath would have a 5½d. rate, while West Ham would have a rate of 2s. 7½d. Could anybody believe that the scheme which the Government outlined in the earlier stages of this Bill was being carried out when two towns were being left in a position so exceedingly unequal as that? Birmingham would have the whole of the additional charge under this Bill entirely met by Government grants, and would be left with a school rate of 1s. 1½d. Therefore Birmingham, which was rich, with a comparatively small child population of about 15 per cent. as compared with 18 per cent. in West Ham in the public elementary schools—Birmingham, with a higher rateable value, would discharge its obligation to the State by the payment of an education rate of 1s. 1½d., and yet the districts to the East of London, the County Borough of West Ham, and the non-county boroughs in the south-east of Essex, would have the burden which presses upon them heavily already accentuated by this Bill. Nothing whatever was done by the Government scheme to meet these burdens except this paltry additional grant of less than £5,000, which would accrue to them under the amended form of the scheme, and they did not even get that on the original form of the proposal. It had been stated that the obvious object of this new aid grant was to diminish the burden thrown upon the locality by the operation of this Bill. He had already pointed out to the Committee that there were districts to the east of London where that burden would not be diminished to the extent of a 1d. rate, while there were other districts where the whole of the additional burden would be borne, and where the rate at present levied would possibly be reduced. In Portsmouth he heard one of the leading aldermen of the town, who had held the position of mayor, declare that the scheme of the Government would not only meet all their charges but would take 2d. off the School Board rate. He could not see why towns like Portsmouth should be treated on a different footing to the towns which were already so heavily burdened. It could not be thrown at these East End districts that their rateable values had been made purposely low, for they had been assessed up to the utmost penny they could bear quite recently. Everything they could get hold of was rated, and yet, in spite of that, their rateable value was as low as £4 8s. 9d. per head of population. While they were heavily assessed they had an abnormally large number of children in attendance. Not a single one of their school debts was yet liquidated. The first school erected in the district had still a debt to pay off. He had shown to the Committee that what was now proposed by the Government entirely failed to meet the necessity pressing upon the ratepayers in the district. It might be suggested that although the School Board rate was heavy, the other rates were light, but the fact was that the local rates worked out at 9s. 8d. in the £, while the average of the country was somewhere between 7s. and 8s. He had tried, at the risk of the loss of lucidity, to compress his remarks as much as he could, but he should have failed in his duty if he had not raised his most emphatic protest against the terms of this Clause. He said frankly that he put his Amendment forward rather as a means of urging the Government to amend their scheme, to so modify it that urgent necessity might be relieved, and that some of the richer districts might bear a fair proportion of what was a national burden. Whitehall fixed the amount of the demand. The local authorities had practically no control over what they must do, and yet the localities were called upon to pay an alarming amount of the expenditure. He felt more strongly, as years went on, that inasmuch as this educational work was a national benefit, it ought to be a national burden thrown in the main on the central exchequer and not upon the local rates. Feeling that, he appealed to the Government to try to find some scheme before the Report stage which might meet the necessities of the districts.

Amendment proposed to the Clause—

"In line 1, to leave out the words, 'And under Section 97 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, as amended by the Elementary Education Act, 1897.'"—(*Mr. Ernest Gray.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

(5.3.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend speaks with great force for the constituency which he represents. That constituency has been, ever since I have been concerned in these questions, a source of great anxiety to those who have had to deal legislatively or financially with educational problems. The truth is that the borough which my hon. friend represents is in every particular a part of London, with the exception of this very important particular from my hon. friend's point of view, that it does not gain by the Equalisation of Rates Act, which affects the Metropolis as a whole. No doubt that does produce a most abnormal state of things. It produces a state of things to which I do not imagine any precise parallel can be found in any other part of the country. I am, therefore, the last to complain that my hon. friend should appeal to the Government to try to find some remedy for that state of things, some alleviation which would content those whom he represents. I confess I cannot accept the particular solution he proposes. I am not absolutely sure that I understand the effect of the Amendment. If his idea is that my right hon. friend is to give all the grant which he has just promised, and the grants to necessitous School Boards in addition, then I take it that the Amendment would be out of order, for it would certainly be in substance, whatever it was in form, asking the Committee to sanction a very large increase of the grant we have just been authorised by the House on Report to give in aid of education. Therefore, I conceive that is not the policy of my hon. friend.

MR. ERNEST GRAY: I recognise that I should be out of order if the Amendment had that effect. This Amendment must necessarily be followed by other Amendments to secure a redistribution of the grant.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The policy which he actually adopts in view of the regulations of the House is not to ask any increase in the amount of the grant, but to ask that the existing grant should be diminished by the amount of the necessitous schools grant, and that the necessitous schools grant should be distributed as at present. I have not been able to work out the figures, but I am not at all sure that my hon. friend would gain much by that procedure. But in my case I think the Committee will feel that, although there may be hard cases, it would be quite impossible for us, and most undesirable, to abandon the general scheme of this Bill, which masses all the grants together, and gives them in one general sum, for the purpose of dealing with this or that exceptional case. I would remind the Committee, what my hon. friend is perfectly aware of, and what he practically acknowledged, that this Bill does him no injury, and that he will not be worse off under the Bill than he is at the present time, but that only there are other parts of the country which will benefit by the Bill more than he will benefit by it. I am afraid that is true, and I am afraid it is inevitable as long as you adhere to the policy which is the policy, I frankly admit, of the Bill. While you may vary the maintenance charges, you cannot pool the buildings. I do not believe the Committee would really tolerate any proposals of that kind. If you once admit that a district which is obliged to provide all its schools must bear a heavier burden than the district which, by good fortune, or for some other reason, had a great many schools provided for it—so long as you admit that there is to be a difference of that kind, so long, I fear, you must admit that there must be a difference between West Ham and some other more fortunately situated districts. My hon. friend would not gain as much as he hopes to gain by the Amendment. No doubt the position of West Ham after the Bill passes will be as it is now, and that it will not be so financially fortunate as compared with certain other districts in the country. For these reasons I think the Government have really no choice but to vote against my hon. friend's Amendment.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that they could not pool the buildings, but he had not offered to the Committee any argument in support of that. He had never heard any argument which had really gone to the point against the pooling of the liabilities of the provided schools. When the Government had taken away by what seemed to him to be the whole principle of the Bill, the local management of the schools by the elected representatives of the locality, it seemed to him that they had gone to the point which necessitated the equalisation, or something like the equalisation, of the charge for these schools. Of course that question did not very well arise on this Amendment. It was not possible for him to support the Amendment, which, however, afforded an opportunity for the discussion of the question whether the money which was to be given should go directly to the district, or to somebody else on behalf of the district. The united districts did not receive the money direct, it went to somebody else for them. There were united districts much larger in population than the urban districts which were named in the Bill as separate districts, and yet the money which was given in respect of the liabilities of those united districts under this Clause was to go, not to them, but to the county, which was only bound to return one quarter, or one half if they so chose. These appeared to him to be cases of monstrous and unnecessary injustice.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he hoped the Government would look with a favourable eye on the suggestion made by the hon. Member for North Camberwell. What might be wanted for the Old Kent Road might not be suitable for an agricultural county. He desired to thank the First Lord of the Treasury for the concession he had made to the agricultural Members; the right hon. Gentleman had tempered the wind to the shorn lamb. He did not mean to say that they were satisfied. It was not their business to be satisfied, but they were grateful; and with an intelligent anticipation of events before they happened, he hoped they should have further relief from the rates before long. He was bound to say that, as a humble agricultural

Member, he would do his best to persuade his supporters that the First Lord and the Government had, under very difficult circumstances, endeavoured to do their best in this matter.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said that the hon. and gallant Member for Chelmsford had said that it was not his business to be satisfied with the Government proposal, and neither was it the business of the Opposition to be satisfied. There were extreme cases like West Ham and some rural districts which would be saddled with great liabilities. In his own constituency—the county borough of Oldham—the rates amounted to 6s. 8d. in the £, of which the school rate was 1s. 9d., and the amount received would only be 1s. 6d. per scholar. The hon. Member for West Ham had, however, not stated what his proposal would amount to in regard to the other grants, and therefore while he agreed with him in principle he could not vote with him.

MR. D. J. MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow) said that the case of his constituency was as bad as that of West Ham, where the population was almost entirely made up of working men from London, and the district had to educate their children.

Question put and agreed to.

(5.25.) MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said he agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, that it was a great pity that they had not had an opportunity of consulting the local authorities in regard to this Clause. Under the provisions of the Bill as originally drafted, instead of the necessitous districts being better off than before, they would be worse. In East Ham instead of getting 8s. 10d. per scholar they would only receive 8s. 2d. under the new scheme. He urged on the Government that a sliding scale was absolutely necessary. It was imperative that some arrangement should be arrived at by which the necessitous districts should be put in such a position as to educate the young children who resided there. He wished this Bill when it became an Act to work easily and smoothly, and it was necessary that there should be no injustice done to any part of the United Kingdom; and that could only be done by the adoption of a sliding scale.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to leave out 'a sum equal to 4s. per scholar' in order to insert 'Wherever the product of 1d. rate in the area of the authority is more than 2s. 6d. per scholar, a sum equal to 3s. per scholar.'"—(*Mr Louis Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said his hon. friend and the Committee would see that this was an Amendment which could not possibly be accepted. If he understood the words of the Amendment correctly, the effect of them would be to make the grant more in certain cases.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: Not the effect of my words.

* THE CHAIRMAN: That was the effect of the hon. Member's Amendment, but the hon. Member must have meant less.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said the words of the Amendment were the converse of what he desired to move, but his position was that as he could not move a reduction, he had to move an increase.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY expressed great sympathy with the hon. Member, who was not in a position to move what he really desired, but at the same time he felt sure that the hon. Member would see that the Amendment was one which the Government could not possibly accept.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he desired to move an Amendment, in line 7 to strike out the words "per scholar." The wording of the Clause as it appeared upon the Paper did not carry out the obvious intention of the Government—

"An additional sum of 1½d. per scholar, for every complete 2d. by which the amount which would be produced by a 1d. rate on the area of the authority falls short of 10s. a scholar."

Supposing they took a district in which there were ten scholars and in which the

1d. rate produced £2 10s. Ten shillings a scholar would amount to £5. The 1d. rate would be £2 10s., and therefore the amount produced by the penny rate would fall short of the amount required by £2 10s. If each scholar was to receive 1½d. for every complete 2d. of the amount by which the rate fell short of the amount required—there were 300 twopences in £2 10s.—1½d. for every complete 2d. would give 37s. 6d. per scholar, or a total grant to the ten scholars of £18 15s. That was not the intention of the Government. The intention of the Government was to give 1½d. on every complete 2d.—not on every complete 2d. "per scholar." The object of his Amendment could be attained either by leaving out the words "per scholar" in line 7, or by inserting the words "per scholar" after the word "twopence" in line 8.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought his hon. friend was quite correct in his statement of the intention of the Government, and he would accept the Amendment but he would prefer it in the manner last suggested by the hon. Member.

Amendment made to the Clause—

"In line 8, after the words 'twopence,' by inserting the words 'per scholar.'"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said it had been conclusively shown that there were a large number of poor parishes possessed of a School Board, the rates of which were extremely high. The First Lord of the Treasury had declined to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member on the ground that it was of an exceptional character and related to only one or two cases in the United Kingdom. The Amendment he now proposed to move was of a different character, the hard cases it was designed to meet being rather the rule than the exception. He quoted the amounts of the education rate in several parishes of Carnarvonshire, to illustrate the necessity for greater relief in extremely poor parishes. In such parishes throughout the country the cause of education would be indefinitely retarded unless the parish, and not the county, were made the unit in this financial Clause. He knew a number of parishes in which a 1d. rate did not produce more than £10 a year.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, to the Clause, as amended, to leave out the word 'authority,' and insert the words 'parish served by the schools.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'authority' stand part of the Clause, as amended."—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Amendment would not carry out the object of the hon. Member, as it was already provided in the earlier part of the Clause that the money should be annually paid to every local education authority. On the merits of the Amendment, he pointed out that the Government had already gone as far as they could to mitigate the burden on poorer parishes by increasing the payment from one-half to three-quarters of the twopence. He hoped the Committee would see that the Government had gone as far as it could in this matter, and would reject the Amendment.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said if the hon. and learned Gentleman had confined himself to saying that the Amendment would not carry out the object his hon. friend the Member for Flint Boroughs had in view, he would not have had anything to say upon the matter, but the hon. and learned Gentleman went further and said that the Committee would recognise that the Government had gone as far as it could. He had never heard any argument from the Government which met the demand for a much bolder step in the direction of equalisation. The total grants under this Clause would now be considerably over two millions of money. In spite of this great increase in the grant, there was nothing being done towards equalising the charges on the parishes. He agreed that the Amendment would not carry out the view of his hon. friend, and therefore, he would try to raise the question at a later stage in order that a division might be taken upon it.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said the difficulties of the Committee had arisen from the Government Amendment having been put down on the Paper so late. The suggestion of his hon. friend the Member for Flint Boroughs seemed to him to be reasonable, and he did not think it ought to be brushed aside in this way. It was worthy of the attention of the Committee. All his hon. friend said was, that having once arrived at the figure to be given to the local authority, they ought to provide for the proper and equitable distribution of the money, so as to make a distinction between rich and poor parishes. That he understood was the object of the Amendment.

(5.48.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 206; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 538.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch’r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King’sLynn
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFr’dDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. SirJ. (Manc’r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose-
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S. W
Fuller, J. M. F.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (CityofLond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T’rH’ml’ts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir EW (B’rySEdm’nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd’x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf’rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Fav’rsh’m
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Lockie, John
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Iver, SirLewis (EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hon. SirFrederickG
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, DavidJ (Walth’mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B(Isleof Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Bowles,Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidst'ne
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt. Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt. Hon. Sir ArthurD.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer,Sir CharlesM.(Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHonC.R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Lewis and Mr. Samuel Evans.

(6.0.) MR. M'KENNA moved to add at the end of line 9, the words, "provided that in estimating the produce of a 1d. rate in the area of the local education authority, not being a county borough the rate should be calculated on the assessment for county rates." Under the Clause the grant would be calculated with boroughs on the valuation for poor law purposes, whereas for the whole administrative county it would be on the valuation for county purposes. Under that plan, in a borough a particular building might be valued for poor law purposes at £50, whereas for county purposes the valuation might be only £40. As the grant was to be calculated on the relation between the rateable value and the number of scholars, it was very important that the valuation by which the amount of the grant was to be determined, should be accurately fixed. In many places property had been intentionally valued at a low rate, and the places in which that was the case would receive special advantage from this grant. The county basis was, generally speaking, very accurate, and it was only fair, as between different local education authorities within the same county, that the amount of grant should in every case be based on the same valuation.

Ammendent moved—

"In line 9, at end to add—'provided that in estimating the produce of a 1d. rate in the area of the local education authority not being a county borough the rate shall be calculated on the assessment for county rates.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY pointed out that all the county was concerned with, was to see that the relative assessments of the different areas within the county were correct. For the purposes of the county it did not matter what the amount of the assessment was so long as the proper proportion between the different areas was observed. The County Council had power to review the assessment of the relative areas, but with the actual amount they had nothing to do. He really thought there was no ground for the apprehension of the hon. and learned Member, and he suggested that he should leave it to the areas to make their assessments correctly.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS agreed with the Attorney General that the only question to be decided was as to the relative proportions the various boroughs and districts had to pay. But could any better plan be suggested than that proposed by his hon. and learned friend? The county assessment was perfectly fair; it was calculated on the same basis throughout, and if the Government would look into the matter they would find that the method suggested in the Amendment was by far the best and most practicable that could be put forward.

Mr. TREVELYAN reminded the Government that they had admitted the existence of the kind of difficulty referred to by his hon. and learned friend, because in the King's Speech they promised a Valuation Bill. That measure had not yet seen the light, but its general idea was taken to be in the direction of carrying into effect the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. Those recommendations were, generally speaking, to assimilate the assessments throughout the different counties under whatever authority those assessments were made. The Amendment, therefore, had some significance.

Mr. M'KENNA was proceeding to quote from the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, when—

Sir ROBERT FINLAY, interposing, said that with a slight modification, there would be no harm in accepting the Amendment. If the hon. Member would move the Amendment in the following form he would adopt it—

"Provided that in estimating the product of a 1d. rate in the area of a local education authority not being a county borough the rate shall be calculated upon the county rate basis."

Mr. M'KENNA said he would accept the suggestion of the Attorney General.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY asked whether the Amendment should not include quarter session boroughs.

Mr. WALTER LONG thought there was no necessity specially to designate quarter session boroughs. The precise words of the Amendment would be considered, and if necessary could be altered at a later stage.

Mr. M'Kenna's Amendment was withdrawn, and the words suggested by the Attorney General were agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Clause, as amended—

"To leave out from the word 'but,' in line 10, to the word 'accordingly,' in line 15, both inclusive, and insert the words, 'If in any year the total amount of Parliamentary grants payable to the local education authority would make the amount payable out of other sources by that authority, on account of their expenses under Part III. of this Act, less than the amount which would be produced by a rate of 3d. in the pound, the Parliamentary grant shall be decreased, and the amount payable out of other sources shall be increased by a sum equal in each case to half the difference.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause, as amended."

(6.15.) **Dr. MACNAMARA** asked the Chairman whether it would be in order for him to move the Amendment he had handed in, as an alternative?

*__The CHAIRMAN__: If the words of the original Clause are struck out, the hon. Member can move alternative words.

Question put and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DR. MACNAMARA said the new Government form of the Amendment was preferable to what they had had before them up to now. He wanted to get back more to the Government's second edition of their original proposal. He admitted that the new proposal of the Government was an improvement, but he objected to the fixing of 3d. in the pound, for the reason that it might be taken as a statutory maximum of obligation and would be likely to become stereotyped as the amount to be raised by the local authority. Such a result would be very disastrous to the schools of the country. He was aware that hon. Members opposite said that 3d. in the pound was quite enough. Lord Salisbury had stated that it would be advisable to write up in letters two feet long over every board school that the rates should never be more than 3d. in the pound. He did not say that the proportion of three-fourths or four-fifths was a thoroughly equitable scheme, but if they laid down that the Government had to find a proportion they should avoid the extremely dangerous probability of it being said that the House of Commons had determined that the statutory maximum which they might be called upon to contribute locally was 3d. in the pound. He proposed as an Amendment the original form of the proviso modifying the three-fourths to three-fifths, because the Government had now found another half-million of money which amounted to one-twentieth of the whole.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out all the words after the word But' and insert the words, 'the total amount paid to any local education authority on account of all the Parliamentary grants in respect of elementary education, including the grant under this Section, shall not in any year exceed four-fifths of the total expenses of the authority under Part III. of the Act, and the amount payable under this Section to a local education authority shall, where necessary, be reduced accordingly.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

(6.20.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The effect of this Amendment, in practice, will not be very extensive. The proposal is in itself an improvement, because it does away with the evil which exists, not in a large number of cases, but in cases where the rate would be under 3d. I think the apprehension expressed by my hon. friend is really unfounded. He seems to think that if we mention a 3d. rate and provide for a certain deduction, it will come to be regarded as a sort of statutory limit. I cannot think that there is anything in that apprehension, because 3d. in the £ is not mentioned as the maximum anywhere. I rather wish it could be so mentioned. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh."]

DR. MACNAMARA: That confirms my apprehension.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: What we do provide is that 3d. is the statutory minimum for the payment of the full Parliamentary grant; and how can the most careless person suppose that that is the maximum? The hon. Member opposite is afraid people will run away with the idea that 3d. is the maximum, but not even the man who runs as he reads could make that mistake. Therefore I think the hon. Member's apprehension may really be dismissed as unfounded. Now I pass to consider the argument put forward by the hon. Gentleman in support of his alternative proposal, which is a variation of the original Government proposal. He proposes that we should say that the Government contribution is not to exceed four-fifths of the total amount provided for in the expenditure or in the Budget for educational purposes for elementary education, and in case anything of that kind happens the Government grant should be reduced accordingly. I submit to the Committee that the proposal of the Government is a better one, for this reason. If you take the four-fifths then you put down £1 and get £4 of Government money. If you take it in reference to a 3d. rate, if you are under the 3d. the difference is shared, so that it is pound for pound from both local and Government sources. I think the hon. Member will see that this really is better, having regard to the varying circumstances of the districts where the rates may be under or over 3d. in the £. Suppose we find the circumstances are such in a certain district that a 2d. rate would be enough for all the expenditure for elementary education, and suppose that a 2d. rate yielded £2,000. Of course a 3d. rate would yield £3,000 and £2,000 would be the full amount of the Government grant. What is proposed now by the Government is that that £1,000 should be divided between the district and the Government, so that the Government grant would be reduced by £500, and £500 would be put on the local rate, and thus you would have a 2½d. rate instead of a 2d. rate. I therefore submit to the Committee that the contention of the hon. Gentleman opposite in regard to the Government proposal is quite unfounded, and as a working proposal I think that what is put forward by the Government is likely to be far more effective.

MR. WHITLEY said this was a very difficult matter for the Committee to balance, having regard to the fact that so little time had been given them to consider the proposal of the Government. He was sure the Committee would pardon him if he tried to present another aspect of the case to that which had been put by the Attorney General. He thought the difference between these two schemes would have just the reverse effect to that which had been described by the Attorney General. Let them remember that the principle of a proportion between Imperial aid and the local rate aid for the purposes of education was fixed by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, as a protection to the country, at three-fourths and one-fourth, respectively. In the case of a local authority not inclined to spend any more than they could be forced to spend on elementary education, and who cared more for saving expenses than for the quality of the education in the district, what result would these two schemes have? According to the scheme of the Government, for every penny the local authority failed to raise they would only lose an equivalent penny of Government grant; whereas by the plan proposed by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, every authority who were so niggardly as to save a penny which they ought to spend would lose 4d. which they would otherwise receive out of the Exchequer, so that, looking at the two schemes from the point of view of progress in education, he had not the slightest doubt that by keeping the proportion of four-fifths to one-fifth there would be a greater stimulus given to education than by the plan proposed by the Government. He could imagine some local authorities saying, that rather than rate themselves to the extent of 3d. they would forego the equivalent 3d. of Government grant. In that way, under the Government proposal, it would be possible to have backward areas throughout the country where local authorities cared more for the saving of the rates than for the good of education. In Wales, in connection with secondary education, the principle was adopted of giving an equivalent grant of a halfpenny for a halfpenny, and he thought everyone would admit that that was a good principle, which had given a stimulus to secondary education there. He appealed to the Government to reconsider what he regarded as their hasty decision in this matter.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said it seemed to him that in a great many places a 3d. rate, which might go a long way in regard to maintenance, would not go far if it included buildings. That being the case he should prefer the proportions proposed by the hon. Member for North Camberwell to those proposed by the Government. In the case of a borough which up to the present time had had no denominational schools, by fixing a minimum of 3d. in the way proposed they really fixed a maximum, and the whole of the money would be wanted for maintenance only. He did not think there was any danger of misunderstanding the words. When an Act of Parliament stated what was to be the minimum, there was a tendency to regard it as the maximum required.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he would point out to the hon. Member how the proposal of the hon. Member for North Camberwell would work in the poorer districts. If the Committee said the proportion was to be a fourth or a fifth, it would be possible to raise the rate to 1s., and that might be a heavy amount for a poor district to raise. Therefore this 3d. rate had been fixed in justice to the poorer districts.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that in some cases the figure might reach 1s., but it was already 1s. in those cases. The Government scheme was to suggest that the amount had better be brought down to 3d. That was what he wanted to avoid.

(6.38) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 219; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 539.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.).
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Capt. Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. SirWilliam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (CityofLond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustus Frederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirEW(B'ryS. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield. Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John(Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Meysey-Thomson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, DavidJ (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Philipps, John Wynford
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isleof Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuffnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H.)Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, SirWilliam (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc. Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar,John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt. Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, TheodoreC. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas,F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace. Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath,North)
Whiteley,George (York,W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Whitley.

Words [of Mr. Balfour's Amendment, as amended,] inserted.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the Amendment he had placed on the Paper was designed to meet certain cases of hardship which would occur under the Bill as it stood. There were groups of rural districts which had hitherto acted as one for the purposes of education. These districts would now be merged in the counties. In his own constituency there was a rural school district with 30,000 population. And he knew of another case of two rural parishes, which had been grouped together by the Board of Education for the purposes of rating for education. There was a denominational school in one parish. The School Board District would now be broken up, but the parish would have to pay the county rate, pay for the denominational school, and would have also to pay the capital debt of the extinguished School Board District, with which in future they would have no connection at all. It seemed to be particularly hard, and totally impossible of explanation to the people, that they would have to pay 3d. or 4d. in the £. more than the people in the neighbourhood.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert in the Clause the words, '(2) The amount paid under this Section shall be allocated by the local education authority in the first instance to the expenses referred to in paragraphs (*c*) and (*d*) of sub-Section 1 of Section 13, if any such expenses are incurred by them.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the Bill did not create the hard cases to which the right hon. Baronet referred. He admitted that the Bill would not cure them, but it would mitigate them. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to make universal a grievance which was at present casual and sporadic. The grievance was that certain artificially amalgamated parishes, which had got schools of their own, were obliged to pay fo schools built in other parishes, and that grievance, which now existed only in these artificially amalgamated areas, the right hon. Gentleman wanted to extend to every county in the kingdom. In the case of a parish which built a school twenty-five years ago and had five years more of the debt to run, the right hon. Gentleman, he understood, would pool the charge; but, on the other hand, in the case of the parish which had for thirty years been paying a heavy charge for its buildings, were they to recoup it? And if not, why not? If it were urged, on grounds of equity, that they should give the privilege to the parishes which came late into the field in regard to the provision of their schools, why should they refuse redress to the parishes which came early into the field? As to the limit fixed, while thinking that the county authority should not be relieved of all obligations in respect of School Board areas, they had thought that all obligations should not be imposed upon them. They had taken the middle course, believing it wise to leave some discretion and latitude to the education authority in order that varying circumstances and cases might not be left out of sight.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he did not feel quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman had authority for believing that in every case the Government had succeeded in alleviating the grievance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, yes; in every case.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: It should be remembered that the poor parishes would lose the necessitous board school. At present the grants earned by a parish were used entirely for that parish, but that would not be so in the future. They would now go to the County Councils and be distributed over the county area. So that against the alleviation to which the right hon. Gentleman referred must be put on the other side of the account the fact that the parishes would lose the advantage they had before of that portion of the grant earned by them. He submitted that the loss would be far greater than any gain which might accrue from the proposals of the Government.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he regretted the Government could not see their way to admit the case put forward by his right hon. friend. The Government had taken upon themselves to lay down principles which they had not the courage to carry out. They were setting up a county management of schools, and they ought to be prepared to face the logical conclusion of their scheme. They came forward with a one authority scheme and a one rate scheme, and several of the Opposition took the view that such a scheme had advantages, the greatest advantage being that there would be a separate rate for each area which would enable the authority to set up a good school in the district. But when the Government laid down general principles they did not, unfortunately, carry them out. The logical conclusion to the scheme of the Government would be to place the whole burden of setting up primary education on the county as a whole. If police stations could be made a county charge, why not schools? The small districts were not fairly dealt with.

*MR. CHANNING said he represented a district where the details of this particular question had been discussed for years, and where the grievances pointed out would be severely felt. Four at least of the School Boards in that division were necessitous boards, from the heavy expenditure they had faced in providing excellent schools. He could assure the Prime Minister that many of those who supported him politically in 1886 and on other occasions when similar suggestions to those embodied in this Bill were under discussion were not disinclined to the proposal to place schools under a county authority, because they believed that these liabilities would be dealt with in a broad and generous spirit. These classes of ratepayers would be profoundly disappointed at the way in which it was proposed to deal with them now. It was only fair to those districts which had contributed in these costly schools solid assets to the county educational system that when they were surrendering the control of the schools they should receive generous treatment in respect to meeting the liabilities incurred in providing the schools.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS hoped the Government had not said their last word on this matter, for he thought a very strong case had been made out showing the great hardship to small localities which must necessarily ensue by reason of the proposals of the Government, notwithstanding the way in which they met the Committee on Clause 13. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had asked whether in the parishes where large expenditure had occurred, the expenditure should be repaid. That, of course, was impracticable, but at the same time to draw a hard and fast line in the Bill would create a very great grievance. The suggestion of his right hon. friend was merely that the Government should begin anew. In the case of a School Board district which might have paid the whole of its debts at the end of this year the School Board of that district had no great burden, but in a few years it might be necessary for them to extend their buildings. That expense it was proposed to place on the county authority, but in the case of a building just erected the building was taken away which had been built with the money of the district, and the people were to be told that they had nothing to do with the matter, except to pay the debt they had incurred in the interests of education. If against such a state of things it could be shown that the burden would be spread over the whole country, and that no particular portion could be made to suffer, it would be an equitable settlement, but the arrangement which was now made was not equitable.

DR. MACNAMARA pointed out that there were a number of small villages where a 1d. rate brought in a precept of from £5 to £25. These villages, at the present time, were rated very heavily, and they had each a liability of from £3,000 to £5,000 in respect of the school they had built. The Government now said to them that they would have to pay the county rate of 3d. and also a differentiated rate until they had wiped out their liabilities, and if they built a new school there would be a differentiated rate until they had paid that also. In the case of those villages which were never rated, and the schools of which were provided out of voluntary resources, that was not a communal charge, and he thought it grossly unjust that those villages which had contracted themselves out for many years should now be asked to pay for those villages which had voted for education in the past. It seemed to him that the scheme of the Amendment was eminently reasonable, and he regretted that the Government had not seen their way to adopt it.

(7.23.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 95; Noes, 213. (Division List No. 540.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight

Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barrett, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durh'm)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas F. Freeman- (Hastings)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Alfred Hutton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romfield)
Smith, Abel, H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Question proposed, "That the proposed New Clause (Aid Grant), as amended, be added to the Bill."

*(9.0.) SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said this was the last opportunity they would have of discussing the Clause, as most likely on the Report stage it could not be debated, and he therefore wished to draw attention to two or three points. It was true that the Government, realising that their first proposal to grant £930,000 was inadequate, now proposed to add a further sum of £465,000. To his mind that was not so satisfactory as if the Goverment had accepted the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford, which laid it down as an essential part of the Bill that under no circumstances whatever should the education rate—for primary as well as secondary education—exceed one-fourth of the total amount to be raised in the area of the local education authority for educational purposes. That was to say, the difference would have to be made good out of the Imperial Exchequer on the sound principle that three-fourths at least of the cost of education should be a national and not a local charge That Amendment was placed on the Paper by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford at the direct request of the Central Chamber of Agriculture. On the ground that the education was to be administered locally, it was felt that there might be a certain amount of local contribution to ensure efficiency and proper economy. The Government, however, thought right to refuse to accept the Amendment and to say that in future no limit should be placed on the amount to be raised out of the local rates, thereby giving great dissatisfaction to agriculturists and other occupiers in country districts. No doubt the tendency would be to raise the standard of education, and very properly so; but he objected to making education unpopular by saying that any improvement of the standard should entail higher rates while there would not be proportional increase of the aid grant. Any increase of local rates would be very unpopular indeed, and certainly hamper the education needs of the area. The Government had laid down the curious proposition that in no case should the local rates contribute less than 3d. in the £. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had expressed a hope that a much higher local rate would be raised in country districts. The Prime Minister cheered that observation, and thus evidently looked forward to the rate being more than 3d. Fortunately for himself, the Prime Minister

was in the position that he would not have to pay any rates under the Bill, and he could cheer the statement with a light heart. That day they had had laid before them the third edition of the Government proposal. The House in this matter had been treated in a most cavalier fashion, and in the interval of which the sitting had been suspended they had not even taken the trouble to present the revised Clause and put it on the Orders of the Day. The Attorney General in telling them what the Clause meant said he would have liked to have made it impossible for the rate to be more than 3d.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I said I should be glad if that were possible.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he was speaking under great difficulties, because he had not the amended Clause before him; there was only the copy in the hands of the Chairman. The Attorney General told them the effect would be that a county where they only raised a 2d. rate, which produced £24,000, would be fined to the extent of £6,000, because the rate was only 2d. It seemed a very curious inducement to economy to say to that County Council, "If you only spend a 2d. rate of the ratepayers' money on education, because you find that quite sufficient, we shall fine you £6,000 by reducing your grant to that extent. On the other hand, if you spend up to the full amount of a 3d. rate we shall not fine you at all but we shall give you the full amount of the grant." Was not that offering an inducement to extravagant expenditure? It was possible that in some local areas the amount required would not exceed a 2d. rate, and although the authority there might carry on the schools efficiently and with economy, it would be fined in the way he had pointed out. Now he wanted to ask what would be the effect of the Clause in the school districts where the School Board now received a grant under the Agricultural Rates Act. Would the district or parish get credit for that amount in the reduction of the rate it had to pay to the county authority, or how would it be treated? The School Board had received the money not merely in aid of the current rate, but also for payment of interest on money expended on buildings, and the grant had been in part made for the payment of the interest. Would the district or parish in future have to pay that interest without any assistance from the grant under the Agricultural Rates Act? He hoped he would be told they would retain all the money given them under the Act, else it would greatly increase the rates in those districts. For it must be remembered that the repayment of three-fourths of such loans fell on the parish as a special rate.

MR. M'KENNA hoped that the Attorney General would favourably consider the Amendment of the hon. Member for King's Lynn which would, in his opinion, improve the wording of the Clause.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that as at present advised, he did not think the words would carry out the object which the hon. Member had in view. The whole matter would, however, be considered. In reply to the hon. Member for South Somerset, he had to say that the grants payable to School Boards under the Agricultural Rates Act would be paid to the authority taking over the functions of the School Board.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Then they will lose the benefit of them?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, as to payment of interest on loans.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said the Clause dealt with the distribution of large sums of money among the local authorities, and it was well to bear in mind that when once they had laid down the principle of distribution, it would become very difficult to reconsider that. They ought to have had fuller opportunities of considering the Government proposal, and they ought to have had laid before them some Return showing what its effect would be. As it was, they were laying themselves open to the charge that they were asking the Committee to vote money under circumstances which nobody could understand. The School Board grant was only £160,000 a year, but now it was proposed to distribute something like two millions annually, and surely there were considerations other than mere rateable value that ought to be taken into account. He would like to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education to consider that the most expensive schools were the smallest schools. It cost far more per head to build a school for a small number of children than for a large number, and it was also far more expensive to administer a small than a large school, if an efficient staff was to be maintained. He thought the Government would have done wisely to bear that consideration in mind in allocating part of this money; they might well have given to a school with an average attendance of less than fifty, two or three times as much as was proposed under the Clause. They would thus have contributed more to the efficiency of education than they would do by increasing the grant per head. The Government should also have considered how the distribution of the grant would be affected by the varying methods of assessment in different districts. He would give one illustration to show how it worked out in the West Riding of Yorkshire—in the case of Sheffield, Leeds, and Bradford. Under the Necessitous School Boards Act, Sheffield now got £6,000 a year, Leeds £3,000, and Bradford nothing at all—yet Sheffield was by far the richest, and Bradford the poorest of the three county boroughs. One explanation was, no doubt, that the capital in Sheffield was mainly invested in machinery, while that in Bradford was in bricks and mortar. Still the fact remained that the three towns had benefited under the Act in question in exactly the opposite direction of poverty and wealth. Seeing that injustices of this kind were almost sure to crop up, he did think the Treasury would have done well to have adopted a principle tribution of this money. It was, indeed, a serious matter that the distribution should be dependent on the different methods adopted in regard to assessments—methods which were calculated to favour wealthy rather than poor districts. In districts which were sparsely populated, and where of necessity the schools were small, it would be well to give a larger amount per head than was given in large schools.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said it was objected that this Clause in conjunction with Clause 13 raised inequalities, especially between the poorer and wealthier districts, and that point had been especially urged by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. But as he pointed out in the debate on Clause 13, the manner in which the burdens would be spread over the whole county would do a great deal to relieve the poorer districts. In the Forest of Dean the School Board rate was very heavy at present; it was, roughly speaking, 2s. 6d. in the £, the expenditure being £14,600 yearly. Out of that £1330 represented the repayment of the principal instalments of loans and £1170 repayment of the interest, or about a fivepenny rate. The County Council under this Clause would have the power if it pleased to reduce this charge by one half, and as the county rate for general expenditure in Gloucestershire was not likely to be more than 4d. the Forest of Dean would in future be called upon to pay about 7d. instead of 2s. 6d. in the £ yearly. Surely this new system of spreading the burden over the whole county was a marked improvement on the old plan, by which each district took its own burden, and went a long way in the direction of helping the poorer districts.

*Mr. ERNEST GRAY said that while no doubt the proposal would be a considerable improvement in rural districts, it must not be forgotten that the ratepayers of the Forest of Dean would still have to bear half the Gloucestershire rate. He welcomed the change because of its further extension of the principle that the State should bear a larger share of the cost of education and the locality a smaller share. Earlier in the afternoon a complaint was presented on behalf of the heavily-rated districts. No one had ever suggested that this difficulty of the heavily-rated districts was an easy matter to deal with. The present scheme would meet a large number of cases, but it would also result in a large number of anomalies, and if the Prime Minister thought that he had finally disposed of the matter he was greatly mistaken. He feared that the new burdens under the Bill would emphasise the difficulties which had existed for a long time, and would exist until the Chancellor of the Exchequer took over a large share of this burden. The great rating authorities would continue to urge the adoption of a scheme such as was proposed in the Bill of 1897, not in lieu of, but as a supplement to, the present scheme. The question was bound to come up again, and he hoped the day would soon come when the Government would deal with the whole question of local taxation. The matter could not be adequately dealt with in a Clause relating merely to the School Board rate. The Government would have to redeem their promise to take up the whole question of local assessments and local taxation, and he hoped that before the period of the present Parliament expired, an adequate scheme would be submitted to the country.

(9.35.) MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) asked what the effect of the Clause would be on School Board districts, which at present in many counties received a sum in aid of the repayment of the principal and interest with regard to loans. He understood that in future this money would go to the County Councils. Would these Councils credit the present School Board districts with this amount?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the point raised by the hon. Member for the Buckrose Division was one of considerable practical importance. If the position was as stated, the small School Board districts would be hit harder even than had been anticipated, because the half of the rates which they received under the Agricultural Rating Act would in future go to the County Council, but the liability would still be a burden on the locality. He thought the Government must have overlooked this point, and he asked what was their proposal for meeting the difficulty.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY reminded the Committee that the equivalent for the fixed contribution under the Agricultural Rating Act was the rating of agricultural land at only half its value. That advantage the agricultural land would still retain, so that the equivalent for the grant would be retained by all Agricultural land in the county, although the grant would in future go not to the School Board but to the County Council. They had, he might also point out, provided that as regarded the liability of the locality it was to be one-half, ranging up to three-quarters. If that was not sufficient, the whole matter might have to be taken into consideration but as at present advised the Government were not prepared to admit that the provision was insufficient.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought that the Attorney General had failed to meet the point. The mere relief of agricultural land hit the small tradesmen and those who were rated for something other than land. The county might take over the burden to the extent of one-half, but on the other hand it need not take more than one-fourth. At present the little parish received the benefit of the Agricultural Rating Act, because although agricultural land was relieved to the extent of one-half the Exchequer took the burden of the other half, but in future the relief would be spread over the whole county. The Attorney General must see that these little parishes would be hit exceedingly hard, and he hoped the matter would be reconsidered before the Report stage.

MR. LUKE WHITE said in the county which he represented there was an agricultural district where, prior to the Agricultural Rates Act, the School Board received from the Poor Rate from land £200 per annum with regard to the repayment of loans and interest in respect of the building of schools. After the Agricultural Rates Act was passed land paid only £100, and the School Board received the remaining £100 under the Act. As he understood it, if this Bill passed in its present form the County Council would receive that £100, and the parish would be the sufferers to that extent. That, he thought, was an injustice the Government could not have contemplated.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the hon. Gentlemen opposite looked only at one-half of the picture. They forgot that the maintenance was also pooled. They must look at the rate as a whole. However, the matter should be looked into in the light of what had been said, but, as he had already said, the Government, as at present advised, considered that their proposal was entirely adequate.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said there was not much in the point of the Attorney General with regard to maintenance, because most of the rate was in respect of buildings, and his experience was that in these small parishes the maintenance practically came out of the Government grants. Probably the Government would reconsider the matter. He hoped that soon there would be a Government who would reconsider the whole question of local taxation. These grants in aid only helped them temporarily to tide over difficulties; they did not meet the real trouble. It was a pity the Government had not attempted to deal with the matter in a complete and thorough manner. These doles relieved the pressure on one class only at the expense of another. The Government had agriculture too much in their minds, forgetting that there was a distressed class in the towns.

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, no.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny the distress in towns?

Mr. WALTER LONG: No. I deny the allegation that we have forgotten that distress.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that at any rate there was no outward visible sign of the inward spiritual grace.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the hon. Member ignored the fact that in the last twelve years the Party to which he belonged had given assistance to the towns as well as to the country districts. He had confined his attention to the Agricultural Rating Act, entirely forgetting that the Act of 1888 gave relief both to the towns and counties, and more to the towns than to the counties.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had in his mind the legislative record of the present Administration, and he thought seven years was good or bad enough for any man or Government to go upon. In the last seven years the Government had discriminated against the towns in favour of one particular industry. This £2,000,000 might have been used to settle the whole denominational difficulty, which had been presented to them as a building difficulty, and nothing else. It was, however, being used for the purpose of perpetuating this sectarian system, which was at the bottom of all our educational deficiencies. What had they done here? They had penalised the districts which built schools, and they practically said to them: "If you build schools you do so at your own expense." They had practically given notice to those parishes that if they built free schools they must do so at their own expense. He regretted that the Government had not taken advantage of this opportunity to settle the whole difficulty.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said that there was one point upon which he should like to have some enlightenment. He was sorry to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not in his place. This proposal meant some additional national expenditure and some addition to the Estimates of the year. He had not heard any estimate of the probable financial effect of this Clause. He had heard the Prime Minister repudiate the charge that this Clause was a grant in aid of voluntary schools. At any rate it was an addition to the system of grants in aid. He had never known a proposal of this magnitude submitted to the Committee before without being accompanied by a careful estimate prepared by the Treasury in regard to its probable financial effect. It would be most discreditable to this Committee if it allowed this Clause to pass without some such statement. He did not know whether anyone on the Treasury Bench was prepared to supply the information he was asking for. He would ask the President of the Local Government Board, who had appeared intermittently to take charge of this Bill, to give him that information. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman if this Clause passed in its present form whether the Government had formed any estimate of the burden which it would throw upon the Estimates, and if so would he tell the Committee the amount of that estimate. (Ministerial laughter.) No doubt it was a matter of laughter with hon. Gentlemen opposite that the expenditure under this Bill should be challenged at all. This expenditure would no doubt be proposed in the shape of an annual Vote which if rejected would destroy the Ministry, but the expenditure incurred would have to be met all the same. How any responsible Government could come down to this Committee without having made up their mind as to the amount of burden entailed by this Clause he could not understand. He could not believe that they had made an estimate, and, therefore, he asked the President of the Local Government Board to tell them how much the money raised under this Clause was going to amount to. Would it be £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 a year?

MR. WALTER LONG: No.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that remark was the first indication that he had had of the amount, and he should like the right hon. Gentleman to give the information he had asked for.

(10.0.) MR. WALTER LONG: I am bound to say that I think the demand of the hon. Gentleman opposite is a most unreasonable one. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have devoted not only a considerable part of this evening, but many other evenings, and a considerable part of the whole time devoted to the discussion of Amendments, to attacks upon the Government because we are charging the rates with an undue proportion of the cost of education, and they have attacked us time out of number for not devoting more money out of the Imperial Exchequer to the relief of this part of local taxation, and they have more than once said that the attention of the ratepayers of the country will be called to the action of the Government in this respect. Now, the hon. Gentleman opposite makes an attack upon the Government because we have not informed the House or the Committee what will be the amount of the charge we are now laying upon the country. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has stated explicitly that, if this new contribution in aid of local taxation is availed of to the fullest possible extent, the demand upon the Imperial Exchequer will be to the extent of £1,300,000. That statement has been made by the Prime Minister. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee was good enough to say that I took an intermittent part in these discussions. Surely the statement the hon. Member has just made, and the question he has asked, is a proof of the fact that he has been taking a far more intermittent part in the discussions than myself, and it shows a greater dereliction of duty on his part than anything which I have been guilty of. With regard to the question put by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs in reference to the relief of taxation, I may say that the view of the Government has been that there should be a fair distribution as between Imperial and local charges. The hon. Gentleman opposite stated that we had not redeemed our pledges as to carrying out the recommendations of the Royal Commission in regard to this distribution. Every hon. Member of this House knows perfectly well that we cannot deal with that distribution as between Imperial and local charges in a Bill of this kind. All that you can do is to bring to the relief of the local rates the Imperial Exchequer, so far as you are able to do so. We believe that we have made a very considerable addition to the relief of local taxation, not only by the original contribution of £920,000, but also by the new contribution of nearly £500,000, and we believe in doing this we have fairly discharged our duty towards those persons who will have to bear the local burden. The amount of the Imperial burden has already been stated, and I cannot help saying that I think the charge of the hon. Gentleman opposite in this respect is not quite just.

MR. BRYCE said he thought that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had mistaken their complaint, which was that so many years had been allowed to elapse without dealing with this question. By this proposal the relations of local taxation with national taxation had been inextricably confused. For the last ten or fifteen years those relations had been getting more and more confused, and this debate had shown how hard it was to get any definite opinion upon this question. He thought something should be done to clear up this confusion. Until something was done to put this question upon a rational and intelligible basis they would not be able to unravel these difficulties. He earnestly commended to the Committee and to the Government the extreme importance of this question, because they were not now able to make out clearly what were the true relations of the taxpayer and the ratepayer, or upon what principle any local subvention ought to rest. The Attorney General had stated that he would consider this question. Did he propose to consider it with a view of asking the House to go into Committee?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I stated distinctly that if the whole question of maintenance was taken into account as well, the arrangement proposed is a fair one.

Mr. BRYCE said he presumed that if further consideration led the Government to think some change ought to be made in this respect they would give effect to it.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added.

New Clause :—

"(1) Nothing in this section shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof: Provided that, where under the trusts or other provisions affecting any endowment the income thereof must be applied in whole or in part for those purposes of a public elementary school for which provision is to be made by the local education authority, the whole of the income or the part thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to that authority, and in case part only of such income must be so applied, and there is no provision under the said trusts or provisions for determining the amount which represents that part, that amount shall be determined in case of difference between the parties concerned by the Board of Education. (2) Any money arising from an endowment and paid to a County Council for those purposes of a public elementary school for which provision is to be made by the Council, shall be credited by the Council, in aid of the rate levied for the purposes of Part III. of this Act in the parish or parishes served by the school for the purposes of which the sum is paid, or if the Council so direct shall be paid to the overseers of the parish or parishes in the proportions directed by the Council, and applied by the overseers in aid of the poor rate levied in the parish."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

(10.10.) **Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON**, upon a point of order, submitted that this new Clause was not in order. In form as well as in fact it was really an Amendment of sub-Section 2 of Clause 13 which had already been passed. This new Clause commenced, "Nothing in this Section shall affect any endowment." He presumed that the Section referred to was sub-Section 2 of Clause 13, which provided that "All receipts in respect of any school maintained by a local education authority shall be paid to that authority." He submitted that the effect of this new Clause was to contradict sub-Section 2 of Section 13, and it ought to have been brought up as an Amendment to sub-Section 2 of Clause 13. That sub-Section provided that the money was to go to the local education authority, minus sums specially applicable for purposes for which provision was to be made by the managers, and this Clause reversed that mode of calculation. Therefore, he submitted that this new Clause was not in order and could only be dealt with on Report.

***The CHAIRMAN**: The question of endowments seems to me to be a very fitting one to be dealt with in the Clause by itself. Clause 13 is already a very long Clause; in fact it was long in its original shape, and it has been considerably added to in Committee.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was referring to Section 2 of Clause 13, which provided that all receipts should be paid to the local education authority. The words "All receipts" had been defined as including endowments. Therefore, this proposition would, in effect, be an Amendment of the general words of sub-Section 2 of Clause 13.

***The CHAIRMAN**: But the same remark would be applicable to all the Clauses. By general agreement this question of endowments, I think, was to be brought up as a new Clause. At least it is my recollection of what took place when the question was discussed. It was by general agreement that the whole question of endowments was to be brought up as a separate Clause.

Mr. M'KENNA asked if it was not necessary that notice should be given of any new Clause which the Government proposed to move. The new Clause they were now considering must have been handed in after the House ceased sitting on Friday night last. This proposal was entirely new and no formal notice had been given of it. It had only come to his knowledge within the last quarter of an hour. The Blue Paper under the head of endowments contained a Clause which appeared on the White Paper as a new Clause, of which no notice had been given to the Committee. He submitted that the proper proceeding was to have moved by way of Amendment to the Clause which stood on the Blue Paper the terms of the Clause on the White Paper.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is sufficient notice that the Clause should appear on the Paper. What I understand by notice is that it must be in the hands of Members and that it must not be produced at the last moment as, unfortunately, too many Amendments have been produced during the last forty-three days.

MR. BRYCE pointed out that whereas sub-Section 2 of Clause 13 declared that all receipts in respect of any school maintained by a local education authority should be applied to that authority, line 6 of the present Clause provided that "part thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to that authority." He submitted that this expressly contradicted the provision which the House had already decided, and such contradictions had frequently been ruled out of order.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion referred to happened some time ago, and I have not had an opportunity of refreshing my memory as to what actually occurred. My recollection is that the question of endowments was raised before, and it was then generally understood that the question was to be brought up again. I think, if I remember rightly, the Prime Minister gave his idea as to the manner in which the question of endowments was to be dealt with, and it was generally agreed that it should be dealt with in a subsequent Clause.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he raised the question of endowments, and he asked the President of the Local Government Board whether "all receipts" included endowments, and he said they did.

MR. WALTER LONG: No, no.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that in any case he submitted that the words "all receipts" did include receipts from endowments which had already been provided for.

*MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) said he introduced the subject of endowments on the Clause requiring the provision of funds for repairs, and in reply to his remarks the Prime Minister promised to deal with the subject in a separate Clause, and went on to sketch terms very much the same as those which were embodied in this Clause. On the strength of the statement made by the Prime Minister his Amendment was withdrawn.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the Clause was introduced in conformity with an undertaking given by the Prime Minister some time ago that the question of endowments would have to be dealt with in a separate Clause, having regard to the double ownership which subisted in the non-provided schools. The Clause was to ensure, where the trust under which the endowment was held indicated that the income was to go in a direction which placed it in the possession of the local authority, it should reach the local authority, and where the trust left it in the hands of the managers it should be assured to the managers. The majority of trusts were general in character, and the Clause proposed to leave them in the discretion of the managers or trustees. But there were other endowments appropriated to particular purposes, endowments for teachers' salaries and other objects, for which the local authority were required, under the Bill, to make provision. These went to the local authority. The object of the Clause was to interfere with the discretion of the trustees as little as possible, but to ensure that where the trust indicated the particular direction of the endowment that direction should be followed out. He thought that was all that it was necessary to say in regard to the first portion of this proposal. As regards the appropriation of the money where it was placed in the hands of the local authority, the question arose, who should continue to be benefited by the income arising from the trust, and the answer obviously was the parish or parishes which the school was intended to serve, and the income arising from the endowment would go in aid of the rate of that particular parish. It might appear to the local authority that it would be more convenient simply to credit the parish with the amount of the rate they would be charged with, or it might be more convenient that the money should be paid to the overseers. That was left to the discretion of the local authority. He believed the Clause carried out substantially the scheme indicated by the Prime Minister, and he hoped the mode in which it was proposed to direct the income of the endowments might find favour with the Committee.

*Mr. HERBERT LEWIS asked the hon. Baronet to explain what was meant by the phrase "parish or district which the school was intended to serve." Cases were very common indeed where an educational endowment, originally at any rate, was intended to apply to several contiguous parishes. In that case, did the expression "parish or district which the school was intended to serve" relate to the parish in which the school was situated, or would it apply to the parishes to which the educational endowment related? He wished information in regard to another point. The Clause stated at the end—

> "If the Council so direct shall be paid to the overseers of the parish or parishes in the proportions directed by the Council, and applied by the overseers in aid of the poor rate levied in the parish."

Supposing a County Council passed a resolution to that effect, was that intended to conclude the matter for all time, or was it intended that the application, so directed by the Council, should only last until the Council had directed otherwise?

Mr. BRYCE regretted that the opportunity afforded by this Bill was not being taken advantage of to make better use of those endowments, which, he believed, aggregated about £150,000 a year, especially in the way of supplementing the needs of the upper kind of education in the rural districts. The new local authorities ought to be put in the position of being able to frame schemes for the application of educational endowments. That proposal was embodied in the Clause of which the noble Lord the Member for the Cricklade Division had given notice, and it appeared to him to be an excellent and useful Clause. He thought it ought to have emanated from the Government. With regard to the particular Clause now under consideration, the Secretary of the Board of Education had spoken as if the trustees of the endowed schools were always the managers. He doubted if that was the case. He rather thought that, in some cases, the trustees were not the managers, and the question arose as to how much was to be the function of the managers and how much the function of the trustees. It must be remembered that the positions of the endowed schools were very different indeed. Some of the trusts were old, while some were quite modern, and he thought the question ought to have engaged the attention of the Government how cases were to be dealt with in which the managers were not the trustees, and provision ought to have been made for the powers to be exercised by the trustees where they were not the same. Here was another position. In the beginning of the Clause they found these words—

> "Nothing in this section shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof. Provided that, where under the trusts or other provisions affecting any endowment, the income thereof must be applied in whole or in part for those purposes of a public elementary school, for which provision is to be made by the local education authority, the whole of the income or the part thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to that authority, and in case part only of such income must be so applied, and there is no provision under the said trusts or provisions for

determining the amount which represents that part, the amount shall be determined in case of difference between the parties concerned by the Board of Education."

But suppose the case of an endowment not destined to any special purpose, suppose it were a small endowment—and there was a large number of them attached to elementary schools—and that there would be no relief to the rates, that the rates and the Parliamentary grant would be required to pay for the current expenses of the school, the result must be that the whole of that small endowment would be applied to the repairs of the school, and thus the managers would be relieved of the burden of repairs which the Bill imposed upon them, and which had been represented during the discussions on the Bill as part of the bargain of placing the voluntary schools on the rates. That consideration became the more important when it was remembered that in a great many cases these schools were not denominational in their foundation, having been established, long before there was a State provision for primary education, for the education of the poor children of the parish, without any direction as to the kind of religious instruction to be given in them. But as these schools fell into the hands of the local clergy and magnates, the practice grew up of giving in them the denominational instruction which in many other schools was given under trustees. If the endowments of these schools were looked into in the same way as the endowments which were dealt with in the Act of 1869 it would be found that they were really not denominational, although they had been used as denominational schools. He saw no reason why, in making a new departure in education, Parliament should give legislative approval to an unauthorised practice, and stamp these schools for all time as denominational. The desire of the pious founder of two centuries ago in establishing these schools was not to relieve the rates, as his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education had contended, but to give children of parts in the parish the chance of rising in the world, by providing them with the means of education, and now that primary education was happily supplied to everybody by the State, the endowments should be applied to helping the children of the parish to obtain a still better education.

10.35.) Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tonbr dge) said it was difficult to understand from the right hon. Gentleman's speech whether he opposed or supported the Clause.

Mr. BRYCE said he desired to amend it, and he put forward three points—first, that small endowments ought to be used for repairs; secondly, that where schools were not denominational by foundation, endowments ought not to be treated as denominational; and, thirdly, that endowments ought not to be used for the relief of the ratepayers.

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said the right hon. Gentleman's first point was that if the endowment were small it should not be used for repairs. He confessed he did not see what difference the size of the endowment made as to its application. The real point was this: It was difficult now to say in many cases what the object of the pious founder was. In most cases endowments were now applied to the general support of the schools. That fell on the general fund, which was now to be divided between the local authority and the managers, and surely the only statesmanlike course the Government could pursue was to divide the endowments somewhat on the principle on which they were now divided. The fact that one endowment was large and the other small had really nothing to do with the case. Then they came to the question of educational endowments. He really thought the right hon. Gentleman was anxious to drag in the religious question on every possible occasion.

Mr. BRYCE: The religious question arises itself in this matter.

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said they were dealing with elementary schools belonging to various denominations which were very largely in some cases supported by endowments, and the question was what they were to do with these endowments. He ventured to say that the denominational question did not enter into that, and if it did enter curious results would follow. If they were to say that these endowments were not to go to the denominations unless they originally belonged to the denominations, the effect would be that a great many of the Wesleyan schools which possessed endowments would have them taken away from them. If these endowments had been used for the general support of the schools, and if the general support of the schools was now to be divided between the managers and the local authority, they must have some system whereby they should be used by these two bodies in future. Suppose they diverted them to some other purpose, what would happen? They would have in that district for the first time a very large school rate, and the people of the parish would be greatly aggrieved because the endowment which they had at present was not used for the relief of the rate or the repair of the buildings.

MR. BRYCE: It is the county rate.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said the whole of the people would contribute to the county rate. Most of the endowments were left before the Act of 1870 came into operation. He quite admitted that since 1870 there had been, perhaps, some misapplications of endowments different from the original intentions of the founders; and in many parishes the result had been that there were no rates, and very small subscriptions. The country would never tolerate the taking away of all these endowments after they had been made use of for thirty years. The Clause might not be theoretically perfect, but he regarded it as a practical and statesmanlike way of dealing with a very difficult question. There was the other question, that these endowments should not go to the relief of the rates, but in some other way for the benefit of the parish. His hon. friend the Member for East Somerset had an Amendment on the Paper which would meet the case. There were some cases where the endowments were so large that they would more than pay the county rate, or a large share of it. He thought it was quite right and proper that in such cases the county authority should have the right of applying to the Board of Education for a scheme to enable them to divert the balance to some other purpose—as, for instance, to giving scholarships in the elementary schools to enable the children to attend a secondary school. In this way they would be able to use a certain part of the endowments in building up the educational ladder, which they all desired to see. The Government having dealt with a most difficult question in a businesslike and sensible way by giving the local authority a portion of the endowments for work which they would undertake in the future, the Board of Education might well be trusted, where there was any dispute, to make a fair division.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) said he rose for the purpose of asking one or two questions as to the interpretation of the Clause. He could not quite congratulate the right hon. Gentleman, or those who were responsible for the wording of the Clause, on the particular use made of the phrase "provision," which was employed in three totally different senses. It could not be denied that there was some doubt and ambiguity as to the interpretation of these words. He agreed that the money provided by these endowments ought to be ear-marked, as far as possible, for the purposes for which it was originally intended, or akin to what was originally intended. There were cases in small towns and large villages in which the endowment was larger than was necessary for the purpose of maintaining a local school, and the inhabitants of these villages would feel very keenly if a new burden were imposed upon them which they had not borne in the past. There were cases in which the founder in years gone by had bequeathed some land which, in his day, would only be a garden patch, but which had been built upon and now yielded a large revenue. In cases of that kind he rather gathered that, although a very large portion of the money was capable of being used for educational purposes, it would devolve on the trustees to decide what was to be done with the surplus. There might, however, be several bodies of trustees connected with one of the same endowments, and it might be necessary, in cases of doubt, for the Board of Education to frame schemes in order to effect a proper apportionment of the funds. He hoped that if it was not possible for the Government to introduce a Clause in this Bill to deal with contingencies of that sort, they would consider the desirability of bringing in a Bill dealing with the subject as a whole. In cases in which the endowments only formed a small portion of the whole, he could not see how any difficulty could arise; but he did see a distinct possibility of difficulty in the future in cases in which the endowments were very large, and in which it might be necessary to decide what should be done with the surplus. In regard to questions as to whether these endowments were denominational or un-denominational, he would not deal with it. Every case should be dealt with on its own merits. They could not group them into classes; every one must form the subject of careful investigation. To endeavour to lay down any general rule would be absolutely misleading. He hoped the Government would give some explanation as to the wording of the Clause, and also what they contemplated in regard to cases in which there was a large surplus available.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen—whose speeches he always listened to with interest and enjoyment, because the right hon. Gentleman was an expert in these matters—knew a great deal, but he did not know everything. He happened to be a "pious founder" himself—not that there was anything to be proud of in that, nor that he wished it. The object of his colleagues and himself was most certainly the reduction of the rates and the minimising of the expenses, and, quite secondarily, the cause of education.

(11.0.) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he desired to ask the Government to consider the real purpose for which these endowments were in the first instance given. Undoubtedly it was for the advancement of education. He felt very strongly that education could be advanced by a system of scholarships. It was very well known that in the rural districts, especially, the average educational advantages for boys and girls were not very great, and he was afraid that there would be opposition to the appropriation of money for secondary schools; but clever boys and girls should be afforded the opportunity of enjoying, to their own advantage and that of the nation, a secondary education through the means of scholarships. Private generosity was quite inadequate to meet such claims. He was very disappointed that the Government had not seized the opportunity of making a start in what he believed to be the only way of building up the secondary schools. He hoped the Government would consider this question afresh, and devote a portion of the money to scholarships.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he asked the Committee to say whether they had arrived at last at the general principles on which the Government proposed to deal with endowments. He maintained that this new Clause departed entirely from what was apparently the original intention of the Government, as expressed in sub-Section 2 of Clause 13. That was to hand over all the endowments to the new education authority, except such portion as was made applicable for purposes for which provision had to be made by the managers. He desired to make a complaint against the Government for putting this Clause down in the shape in which it was, and then altering it. Here they had a Clause put down for Second Reading, and he thought it was intolerable that after forty-three days spent in considering the Bill they should have a Clause on the Blue Paper and another Clause on the White Paper, both on the same day. The practical effect of this Clause would be that where there was a general endowment for the support of the schools and the sum of money was sufficient for the purpose, the managers would claim it for the repair of the school and they would thus be relieved from any burden in respect of repairs. Where provision was made for the use of only part of the endowment the managers would ask the education authority to decide how much should go to repairs and how much to the local authority, and the education authority would relieve the managers of the only pecuniary obligation that rested upon them. That showed that in this Clause the Government were running away from their own intentions as expressed originally in sub-Section 2 Clause 13. Wherever there was an endowment, there would be no obligation on the managers to effect repairs. The more they saw of the Bill, the more they saw how the bargain was being whittled down. Was the Committee prepared to say that, in the case of schools having an endowment, there was to be no burden at all on the managers in respect of repairs? Where, in that case, was that part of the bargain which rested on the managers, if they were to be enabled to lay hands on an endowment for the purposes of repairs? No other pecuniary obligation rested on them at all. The obligation to effect repairs was one of the reasons why they were given the appointment of the head teacher and a two-thirds majority on the board of management. The second portion of the Clause dealt with cases where the trust deed provided that only part of the income should be applied by the managers. He was not quite sure that he understood the second part; but it appeared to him that in such cases the managers would ask the Education Department to say how much they should have for repairs and how much should be given to the education authority, and they knew that the Education Department would be prepared to relieve the managers of the only pecuniary obligation which rested on them. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich blessed that proposal. He got an interpretation the other day from the Government which had not been given in the House.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) dissented.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that an interpretation had been given as having behind it the greatest weight of legal authority, but the noble Lord did not feel fully satisfied with it. He himself thought it strange that such a legal explanation should have been given to the Bishop of London or to anyone else which had not been given to the House of Commons. He would not be in order in discussing that question, but he had said enough for his present purpose. His objections to the Clause were that, broadly speaking, it excluded endowments from the operation of the Bill altogether; and that if an endowment was to be applied only in part for purposes which were the purpose of the new education authority, it was not to be handed over to that authority until, at any rate, the managers had got their slice out of it for repairs. He thought that the Committee had a right to complain of the variations in the second part of the Clause. His right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen objected to money given by pious founders being used for the relief of the rates, but the lines to which his right hon. friend objected appeared only on the White Paper, and did not appear at all on the Blue Paper. The conclusion which he had arrived at, and which he humbly pressed on the Committee, was that in this Clause the Government were running away from their own intention as expressed in Clause 13. The Clause now before the Committee was entirely subversive of the principle in Clause 13. It was wrong in itself, and he hoped the Committee would not accept it.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he thought that the controversial part of the Clause was sub-Section 2; but the discussion had ranged over a wide circuit, and included matters which appeared to him to be wholly irrelevant. When the hon. Gentleman said that the Clause was wholly contrary to the policy of the Government as expressed in Clause 13, he must surely remember that, weeks before Clause 13 was reached, the Prime Minister declared that endowments would be dealt with separately and in a manner which practically corresponded to that in the Clause before the Committee. The policy of the Government had been then expressed, and was now carried into effect. The hon. Member for the Flint Boroughs asked him what was meant by the words "parish or parishes," and whether they would include the whole area to which a charity was intended to apply. The words were exactly what they implied; and the rates of all parishes concerned would be aided. The main objection to the Clause was that they had not uprooted the whole system of elementary school endowments, and had not proceeded to consider whether they should not be applied to the purposes of secondary education. The Bill was quite large enough already; and he thought, if the Government endeavoured to carry out such a measure as that indicated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, it would involve at least another week's controversial discussion. Then they were told that they were neglecting the intentions of the pious founder when they used his benefaction in aid of the rates of the parish he intended to benefit. No one in the House was more bound to have regard for the memory of pious founders than he was, and after what had fallen from his hon. and gallant friend his regard was greater than ever before. They were not departing from the intention of the founders; the money would be spent on education in the particular area the educational advantage of which the founder intended to promote, and would be spent strictly in accord with the intentions of the founder as far as they could be followed. As to whether the endowments were originally of a denominational character or not, that was really a question as to the terms of the trust; and the intentions of the founder would be determined by an inquiry into the terms of the trust, and from information from other sources. When they were told that the managers would be relieved of all liability, that statement seemed to proceed from the assumption that the endowments were large, and that grasping managers would reserve the whole of them. As a matter of fact the endowments were usually small, and the object of the Clause was to ensure endowments going to the purposes for which they were intended. If they were intended for purposes with which the educational authority had to deal, then the endowment would go to that authority, and where the endowment was expressly or impliedly for purposes with which the managers had to deal then it would go to the managers. He suggested that the Committee should come to a decision on the Second Reading of the Clause, and take a closer discussion on the controversial sub-Section.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked if in the event of an endowment of £50 being found to have been given for general support of a school and the repairs cost £20, the managers would be required to hand over £30 to the education authority?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he wished to remind the Committee that when Clause 13 was under discussion the Government rejected the proposal for an audit on the ground that, except for repairs, the managers would have no money except money given to them by the County Council. It was evident the present Clause was not then in mind, and, seeing that the managers were to retain possession of other funds, would the audit Clause be reintroduced?

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said that the Amendment he moved to Clause 13 was on the ground that the managers would have no money for which they need render an account to the local education authority.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was not referring to the hon. Member; but if the hon. Member would refer to the report of the discussion he would find he was not correct, even as to the reason he had given for moving his own

Amendment. The reason alleged on all sides was that the accounts of the managers would be the accounts of agents, with the sole exception of the money required for repairs.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON: And religious instruction?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he would invite the hon. Gentleman to read the report of his own speech.

Mr. HERBERT ROBESTSON said he distinctly mentioned religious instruction.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was absolutely certain he did not remember it. The reason the audit was withdrawn was that the managers would not have a single farthing except money for repairs, for which they would not have to account to the County Council. He was quite sure that the Clause before the Committee was an after-thought, and that it was not in the mind of the Government when the provision relating to audit was being discussed. It now appeared that the managers would have money for which they would not be responsible to the County Council; and he would ask the Secretary to the Board of Education, as the managers would now retain possession of funds for which they would not have to account to the County Council, would he be prepared to re-introduce the provision as to audit which had been deleted under a misapprehension.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he wished to ask the Parliamentary Secretary what would happen to non-sectarian endowments which had been allocated to elementary education under schemes of the Charity Commissioners. The managers of denominational schools would obtain money from two sources; the principal source would be the State, but the denomination would also find a certain amount for repairs. In return, the denomination would have the use of the school on Sunday, and three evenings a week, and also the denominational atmosphere All these purposes were strictly denominational and sectarian, and he therefore wished to know what would happen to non-sectarian endowments which had been allocated under schemes of the Charity Commissioners for elementary education. There were many such cases before the year 1870, and he wished to know whether or not such trusts were now to be applied to sectarian objects. If so, it was certain that they would not be acting according to the wishes of the donors, but simply on the authority of the Charity Commissioners. It was perfectly true that the Charity Commissioners could give a legal title, but it was certain they could not give a moral title; and to his mind it was absolutely essential that the claims of a religious denomination to property should be based on a moral title. He did not think that a religious denomination should base its title on a scheme of the Charity Commissioners; yet, if he read the Clause aright, non-sectarian endowments would be applied to denominational purposes. He did not think that was right from the moral point of view, and he hoped the Committee would be informed as to the intentions of the Government in regard to such endowments.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that under the terms of the Clause, where the purposes of the trust were such as the local authority should meet, the money would go to the local authority; where they were purposes within the discretion of the managers, the moneys would be retained by the managers. The whole object of the Clause was to deal with the trust moneys in accordance with the trust deed.

Mr. SOARES asked whether the Charity Commissioners would definitely allocate the proportions.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that where the endowment was general, and the managers had the discretion, they would exercise that discretion. Where the endowment was educational the Clause would regulate the procedure. In the case referred to by the hon. Member for Mid Glamorganshire the managers would not be bound to hand the money over to the local authority, but they would be bound to retain it for the purposes of the trust.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he spoke of money given for the general support of the school.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that if it was given for the general support of the school, that would put it into the managers' discretion as to what would best conduce to the general support of the school. If they thought that a building fund would be in the general interests of the school they could apply it to that. What had been said about audit rested on a misconception. The managers would have no money from the local authority which would not be strictly audited. The money they received as trustees they would be responsible for as trustees, and that would not come under Local Government Board audit. Every penny dealt with by the local education authority directly or through the managers would be audited.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that Clause 13, sub-Section 2, was never intended to apply to the receipts mentioned in the Clause before the Committee.

(11.38.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 182; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 541.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon, Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Layland-Barratt, Francis

Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Mansfield.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he proposed to omit the first words of the section, as follows:—

> "Nothing in this section shall affect any endowment or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof. Provided that."

He wished to know what was the object of the words. There was no particular reason for starting a Section, which was originally only an Amendment to a Clause, but had now blossomed out into a new Clause, with a preamble making a general declaration.

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 1, to leave out the words '(1) Nothing in this section shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof. Provided that.'"—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he hoped he had made it clear that the object of the Government was to interfere as little as possible with endowments. It appeared to them most important that the Clause should state at the outset that endowments, or the discretion of the trustees in respect thereof, were not to be affected except as expressly provided. He thought these words were really esential.

MR. M'KENNA asked if there was anything in the Bill giving the local education authority power to examine trust deeds. Unless the words were struck out, it was quite possible that the local education authority would not know anything about the amount of the trust funds.

MR. WHITLEY said the words were very objectionable, as they would throw all the bias in favour of the trustees and against the local authority. If the words were retained they would give the trustees the whip hand, and would put the county authority out of Court. The position had been explained to the Committee by the Secretary to the Board of Education, who said that if there was a trust for the general purpose of educating the children of the poor in a particular parish, the trustees would have first call on it, and would state the amount they considered they required, not only for the actual repairs of the fabric, but also for the maintenance of a building fund for the future. There should be a full inquiry, and the Board of Education or some other authority should decide as between the trustees, and the local education authority. If the words were retained the local authority would have its hands tied; the trustees would have first call on the funds; and only the balance would be handed over to the local education authority.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said he hoped the Committee would not agree to omit the words, as they were absolutely necessary for the allocation of the endowment. Unless the words were inserted, the matter would be left vague.

MR. M'KENNA asked who would interpret the trust deed in the first instance.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said, of course, the trustees would; but as the hon. Gentleman knew, any interested persons could move for an inquiry into the circumstances of any charitable fund. If information were conveyed to the Charity Commissioners by responsible persons, an inquiry was immediately set on foot; and if the local authority had reason to believe that the managers in any particular case were taking the whole of a trust fund, when a part of it undoubtedly ought to be given to the local authority, they could go to the Board of Education and ask for an inquiry; and the Board of Education would at once put the matter into the hands of its law officers. He could not understand how the Clause would read if the words were omitted.

MR. BRYCE said it was difficult to know what the relations between the local authority and the trustees were to be. It was quite clear that the local authority ought to have knowledge of what the trusts were, and how they were managed; and to enable them to do that, they ought to be able to inspect th trust deeds and call for any information from the trustees. He wished to know whether there was any such provision in the Bill. He confessed he could not find it. The words to which his noble friend objected seemed to imply that the functions given to the local authority by the Bill would not in any way cover endowments or jurisdiction over endowments, which were reserved in the fullest way to the local trustees, subject only to the jurisdiction of the Board of Education. That was not right. He did not think that anyone would deny that the local authority ought to have a *locus standi* in the matter as against the trustees. If the hon. Gentleman representing the Charity Commissioners would inform the Committee that the local authority would have that power, he would be satisfied; but, as at present advised, it seemed to him that the local education authority would have no *locus standi.*

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 18*th November*, 1902.

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1).

Water Provisional Order.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation.

Dunbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation.

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation.

Richmond Hill (Preservation of View).

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway.

North-West London Railway.

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, &c.).

Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway (Abandonment).

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 2914. Japan (Kobe).

SAMOA No. 1 (1902).

Decision given by His Majesty Oscar II., King of Sweden and Norway, as arbitrator under the Convention signed at Washington the 7th of November, 1899, between the German Empire, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the United States of America, relating to the statement of certain claims on account of military operations conducted in Samoa in the year 1899; given at Stockholm, 14th October, 1902.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891.

Licence to be at large granted by His Majesty to Henry Goodwin under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule "A." of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at Four o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 18*th November*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, being returned—

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills [see page 1225].

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Coatbridge; Burnbank; Grahamston; and Shettleston; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Maulden; Hamilton; Sheffield; and Suffolk; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: From Burnbank; Shettleston; Coatbridge; and Grahamston; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Anfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Sleat, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Coatbridge; Burnbank; Grahamston; and Shettleston; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented of licence granted to Henry Goodwin, a convict, permitting him to be at large, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of The Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented of University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow No. 2) (Regulations for Degrees in Science in Public Health) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 375.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Civil Service Examinations—Entrance Fees.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembroke): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that there is only one Admiralty junior appointment vacant, for which the Civil Service Commissioners are advertising an eight days examination on 25th November, to be held simultaneously in London, Dublin, and Edinburgh, at a fee of £6; and will he state what number of candidates have entered for the examination; and whether he will consider the desirability, when the number of vacancies is small, of reducing the entrance fee.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Thirty-three candidates have entered for the competition for the one junior appointment advertised in the Supply and Accounting Departments of the Admiralty. Fees payable by candidates are fixed with reference to the salary of the post competed for, and to the prospects of promotion from it. The office referred to in the Question is of a value to justify the highest fee—£6. The amount of fees received does not meet more than half the expenses of the Examining Department. I cannot hold out any prospect of the fees being altered where the number of competitors in a particular case is smaller or larger than the average.

Navy—Cost of Training Seamen.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the cost per head for trained seamen, from the time they join till they have passed through the gunnery and torpedo schools and are regarded as efficient.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) I shall be happy to give this information, but it will take a few days to obtain it. I should be glad, therefore, if the hon. Member will repeat his Question next week.

H.M.S. "Terrible"—Christmas Leave.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the leave of the men of the "Terrible" will expire just before the beginning of the Christmas leave, the Lords of the Admiralty can see their way to allow the men to combine the two periods of leave so as to return after Christmas.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The Christmas leave at the ports has to be arranged in connection with the general duties of each port, and with regard to the *personnel* as a whole. The Admiralty do not consider it desirable to instruct the Commander-in-Chief to except from these considerations the men of any individual ship.

Education Bill—Agricultural Grant.

MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, under the Education Bill, County Councils will have to pay or credit each parish within a School Board district the proportion of grant now payable to School Boards under the Agricultural Rates Acts, 1896 and 1901, in aid of repayments of loans and interest.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) This question was dealt with in the debate in the House of Commons on the 17th instant.

Appointment of School Managers.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education, in cases where there are no foundation managers of non-provided schools, or where the school buildings are the private property of individuals, on what principle is it proposed that the managers of the school shall be appointed; in cases where the present number of managers of a non-provided school is, under the trust deeds of the school, either more or less than the number required by the Act, how will the number be increased or diminished, as the case may be, so as to obtain the number required by the Act.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The process by which foundation managers are to be appointed under the circumstances set forth in the Question is clearly stated in the new Clause, the insertion of which will be moved by the First Lord of the Treasury on the 19th instant.

Responsibility for School Buildings.

MR. MANSFIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will explain what is meant by the words keep the school house in good repair, and make such alterations and improvements in the buildings as may be reasonably required, in Clause 8, sub-Section (*d*), of the Education Bill now before Parliament; does good repair include the making good of the ordinary wear and tear of the buildings; does this term cover the whole of the school premises, *i.e.*, the playground, outbuildings, and offices; are the managers to be responsible for the enlargement of the buildings required by the growth of the school; and will he draw up and insert in the Schedule a model form of agreement to be made between the trustees of a non-provided school and the education authority, giving the exact terms of what may be required from them.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I must decline to answer questions which relate to the interpretation of details of a Bill which is still under discussion in the House of Commons. I do not propose to insert in the Schedule such a form of agreement as the hon. Member proposes.

Education Committees — Delegation of Work to Local Committees.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): To ask Mr. Attorney General whether, under the Education (England and Wales) Bill, an education committee will have the power to delegate, or transfer subject to confirmation, the whole or part of its work to local committees; and whether it is necessary that all or any of the persons appointed to serve on a local committee shall be members of the education committee.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) The hon. Member will find that it is proposed to deal with this point in paragraph 6 of the first division of the First Schedule, on page 33 of this day's White Paper.

Position of Cann Hall District.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): To ask the President of the Local Government Board under which authority the district of Cann Hall will come, under the provisions of the Education Bill, seeing that Cann Hall has its own poor law officers, is incorporated with Leyton for sanitary purposes, and allied at present with Wanstead under the School Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Cann Hall appears to be a parish in the Leyton Urban District. That district has a population which, according to the last census, exceeds 20,000. Under the Bill the Urban District Council will be the local education authority throughout the district for the purposes of elementary education, and the Essex County Council for the purposes of higher education.

Arrest of Mr. Lynch, M.P.

MR. JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): To ask Mr. Attorney General whether he will state when the hon. Member for Galway city was arrested in England; if his arrest was consequent on a communication from the hon. Member himself, and how many times he has been brought before a magistrate and remanded for want of necessary evidence; when was the hon. Member last remanded, and for how long; and can he state when the Crown expect to be able to resume the case against the hon. Member.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) The arrest took place on the 11th June, 1902. I understand that he had written a letter, which appeared in the public Press on the 6th day of June, 1902, to say he was coming to England, but the information had been prepared some months before his arrival. There were nine remands, four of them being in consequence of the fact that some of the witnesses had returned to South Africa, in consequence of his not returning to England earlier, and had to be brought back. The evidence was completed, and the committal for trial was made on the 1st August. Notice to summon a grand jury, which is a necessary step in this case, has been given, and there will be no avoidable delay in proceeding to trial.

Treatment of Jews in Roumania.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state when the recent correspondence upon the treatment of the Jews in Roumania will be laid upon the Table.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) I hope my hon. friend will not find my answer very disappointing, but I can only refer him to that given to him by my right hon. friend at the head of the Government on the 20th October.† No useful purpose would be served by presenting correspondence in the present stage of the question.

Ireland—Railway Loans—Carndonagh-Calduff Railway.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland how much of the £500,000 voted by Parliament under the Railways (Ireland) Act, 1896, has been unallocated; and whether, out of the unallocated balance, with a view to the development of the North Donegal fisheries, he will consider the advisability of giving a grant in aid of an extension of the Carndonagh Railway to Calduff.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The entire sum mentioned has been hypothecated. By Section 9 of the Marine Works Act, 1902, any sums liberated under the Act of 1896 will be applied for the purposes for which advances may be made under the former Act.

State Purchase of Irish Railways.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, during the Chief Secretaryship of the First Lord of the Treasury, inquiries took place with reference to the State purchase of Irish railways; that, with a view of carrying out such a scheme, Mr. Thomas Robertson was appointed chairman of the Irish Board of Works, and reported favourably thereon; whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the Report and other communications relating thereto; and whether he will consider the advisability of recommending the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No, Sir. I am not aware that such inquiries were instituted. The First Lord in April, 1897, in reply to a Question of the honourable Member for West Waterford, stated that he knew of no reason for departing from the conclusions of the Royal Commissions appointed in 1865 and 1886. They were adverse to the policy of State purchase. I am not prepared to recommend the appointment of a third Royal Commission.

Cavalry and Infantry Officers' Entrance Examinations.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the recent changes whereby officers are now provided with furnished quarters and supplied with chargers if in the mounted branches of the service, if he will consider the advisability of again placing the entrance examinations for cavalry and for infantry on an equal footing both as regards age and requirements, and of allowing the choice of the two services to candidates, in accordance with the number of marks they obtain, as is done in the Woolwich examinations for Engineers and Artillery.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The suggestions of the hon. Member will be considered, but until the new system has been tested I am not prepared to advise any change.

---

† See preceding Volume, page 219.

Army Promotions—Length of Service.

SIR ROBERT PENROSE-FITZGERALD (Cambridge): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the length of service after which Majors and Captains are being promoted respectively to the ranks of Lieutenant-Colonel and Major is greater in the case of officers of the Royal Garrison Artillery than in that of the Royal Horse and Field Artillery, and of officers generally throughout the Service; and whether it is proposed to make any provision in the Army Estimates of 1903–4 for redressing the alleged grievance.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The periods of service in each rank have been affected in some branches by the war. I am proposing, by a reduction in the rate of absorption of the supernumerary majors, to remove the alleged grievance.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Island of Lewis—Social Condition.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state why the Special Report on the social condition of the Island of Lewis by the Crofters Commission has not been circulated to Members, although it was laid upon the Table of the House four weeks ago.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Special Report to which the hon. Member refers will be circulated this week. The Report was laid upon the Table on 22nd October.

MR. WEIR: It is not to be found in the Library.

Aird School Playground, Stornoway.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the School Board for the parish of Stornoway have been communicated with as to the desirability of providing some kind of shelter in the playground of Aird School as a protection during severe weather for the children who attend the school; and, seeing that His Majesty's Inspector has recommended shelters for Highland schools, will the Education Department take some action in the matter.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I can add little to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member on 3rd November.† His Majesty's Inspector is quite alive to the matter in question, and he will consider it with the School Board. But he believes that the advantages of such sheds may not be commensurate with the cost, and that in some cases it is better to give access to the schoolrooms in case of boisterous weather during playhours.

Island of Lewis—Local Government Inspection.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that Mr. Millar, the Local Government Board's Inspecting Officer under the Public Health Act, spent four days in the Island of Lewis in the month of May last, will the Secretary for Scotland state what townships in the parishes of Stornoway, Barvas, Lochs, and Uig were visited by this officer; has he made any report on the sanitary condition of those parishes; and, if not, will he be required to state why the conditions of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, are not enforced.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Mr. Millar's visit to the Lewis was primarily for Poor Law purposes. He, however, also made a report on sanitary matters which may be of assistance to the Board.

MR. WEIR: What townships did he visit?

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am not aware.

MR. WEIR: He did not visit one.

Mid-Week United States Mails.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the accelerated mail train service in connection with the mid-week United States mails via Queenstown, by means of which it was possible to deliver mails in New York some four hours earlier than previously, has been discontinued; and whether he will consider the advisability of continuing the accelerated service for the purpose of securing early delivery of correspondence, even though its expense has to be borne by the Post Office.

---

† See preceding volume, page 1381.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): The service to which the hon. Member refers has been discontinued; but he is mistaken in supposing that it was an accelerated service. The time gained in delivery on the other side was lost by the public posting the correspondence here. The arrangement had, therefore, no postal advantage; and when it was made in deference to the wishes of the White Star Company it was conceded somewhat reluctantly, as it cut short the time for posting letters for the United States in this Country on Wednesdays by some hours of a business day. Now that the company no longer requires the continuance of the arrangement, those hours have been recovered, while the mid-week course of post to New York is no longer than it was before.

Stornoway Mail Service.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been directed to the age of Messrs. Macbrayne's mail steamers "Glencoe" and "Gael," running between Kyle and Stornoway; does he propose to take steps to require Messrs. Macbrayne to carry His Majesty's mails in steamers of modern type; and will penalties be enforced against the firm when their mail steamers fail to keep time.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The "Glencoe" is not employed on the mail service to Stornoway. The hon. Member probably refers to the "Glendale" which has recently been performing the service. I understand that the "Glendale," was built in 1875, and the "Gael" in 1867, and that the latter steamer was fitted with new engines and boilers in 1892. Both of these steamers fulfil the requirements of the mail contract; and in view of the heavy loss already incurred in connection with this service, I cannot promise to take any steps in the direction indicated. I have given directions that in cases where time is lost without any satisfactory explanation, the question of imposing a penalty shall always be considered.

St. John's Church Day Schools, Sutton-on-Plym.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been directed to the case of Alice Emily Keates, attending the day schools of St. John's Church, Sutton-on-Plym, Plymouth, who declares that she was required by the schoolmistress to bow and make the sign of the Cross on passing an image of the Virgin Mary in the church, to which the school was taken twice a week and on Saints' days, and was caned by the mistress for her objection to do so, until her removal from the school by her father in February last; and whether he will investigate the matter, and state what steps he proposes to take to prevent the repetition of such proceedings.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): This information relates to a period which ended nine months ago; and no complaint has been made to the Board of Education. The statutory declarations of the girl and her father, sent to me privately by the honourable Member are being communicated to the managers.

Plymtree Schoolroom.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Rector of Plymtree, Devon, refused on the 5th November, to the Liberal candidate for the Tiverton Division, the use of the schoolroom for a political meeting, alleging an attack on Christian teaching in schools; and will he withhold the public grants from schools the use of which is refused for such public purposes.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I have no information on the subject. The managers are under no legal obligation to grant the use of the schoolroom to the candidate for the purpose of a political meeting. Their refusal would be no ground for the withdrawal of the Parliamentary grant.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the Hon. Baronet inquire into the circumstances and see if the facts stated in the Question are correct?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: No, Sir. The Board of Education has no authority in this matter.

Irish-Speaking Magistrates and Post Office Officials.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the large Irish-speaking population in the counties of Galway, Mayo, Waterford, Kerry, Clare, Donegal, Cork, and Sligo, he will recommend that in the appointment of magistrates and post office and other officials in these Irish-speaking districts a knowledge of the Irish language will be insisted on as a necessary condition.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Applications and recommendations for the Commission of the Peace are made to the respective lieutenants of counties. In Irish-speaking districts, interpreters are employed at assizes, quarter sessions, or petty sessions courts. Questions relating to post office appointments should be addressed to my right hon. friend the Postmaster General.

Grant for Publication of Irish MSS.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the amount of the yearly grant paid to the Royal Irish Academy for the copying of Irish manuscripts and the production of an Irish dictionary; whether he can give the approximate date when an Irish dictionary will be issued by this body; and, if not, will he consider the advisability of transferring the grant to the Irish Texts Society.

MR. WYNDHAM: No portion of the grant in aid is ear-marked for either of the objects mentioned. But in each year a sum of more than £300, on an average, is expended on the publication of Irish Texts, the occasional purchase of Irish MSS., and the collection and arrangement of material for the production of an Irish dictionary. The collection of material is now nearly completed and its preparation for dictionary arrangement has already commenced. It is impossible to fix, even approximately, the date when the dictionary will be issued. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

MR. TULLY: Why will not the right hon. Gentleman hand over this task of compiling the Irish dictionary to a more energetic body?

(No answer was returned.)

Michael Muldowney.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when it is proposed to release Michael Muldowney, who was convicted of complicity in the Craughwell tragedy eighteen years ago in Sligo.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Lord Lieutenant, in whom is vested the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, desires me to say that the case of this convict will be specially considered by him on the 23rd January next.

Business of the House—Indian Budget Debate.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he is now able to state when an opportunity will be given to resume the debate on the Indian Budget.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I hope to take the Indian Budget on Friday next. I cannot promise that the whole of the day shall be devoted to the Indian Budget, as I may have to ask the House to proceed with the Osborne Estate Bill, but the Indian Budget will be the first Order.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Will any other business be taken on Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; nothing else.

China Squadron—Supply of New Zealand Coal.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the New Zealand coal supplied to the China Squadron emits such volumes of smoke as to make signalling difficult, and often betrays the position of the ship using it long before her masts appear in sight.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is known that New Zealand coals emit more smoke than Welsh coal of good quality. The Commander-in-Chief has recently reported that the steaming qualities of the coal are excellent, and since the stokers have become accustomed to its use the quantity of smoke emitted is less than it was.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if his attention has been drawn to a memorandum recently issued to senior officers on the China Station in reference to the friable nature of Westport coal, and the large proportion of small coal it contains, and desiring that its value should be made known generally in order to anticipate complaints which may be made by officers unacquainted with this coal; and will he say if it is the practice of the Admiralty to anticipate complaints of stores supplied to the Navy.

MR. PRETYMAN: It was recently pointed out to the Commander-in-Chief on the China Station that cargoes of Westport coal were, for various reasons, likely to comprise a larger proportion of small coal than is the case with Welsh coal, though the steaming qualities of the former had been found from experience not to be affected seriously thereby, and he was directed to inform commanding officers of H.M. Ships to this effect. It is probably to some memorandum issued by the Commander-in-Chief in pursuance of those directions that the hon. Member refers. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the negative.

War Office Clothing Contracts.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether there is any provision in the tenders for clothing given out by the War Office that the work is to be carried out in factories; and, if so, if he will state whether a contract has been given out for 20,000 garments to a contractor who has no factory, and is carrying it out by means of outworkers.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): In reply to the first part of the Question, there is a stringent clause to this effect in the clothing contracts. In reply to the second part, no such contract has been made.

Commissions for Militia Officers.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that Militia officers who resigned and enlisted to get to South Africa lost the chance of obtaining commissions in the line without examination, as was done by their comrades who remained at home, he will consider the advisability of candidates both with and without service marks competing in the same category, service marks being given according to length and character of service, and of removing the restrictions as to the counting of service marks from March last only, also of not limiting the time for the counting of such marks to March next.

LORD STANLEY: The effect of the hon. Member's proposals would be to give the candidates claiming service marks an unfair advantage over the other competitors, and his suggestion to give service marks according to character of service is impracticable. I am not therefore prepared to make the alterations suggested. All candidates who have been in South Africa will have had nearly twelve months in which to prepare themselves before the examination in September, 1903.

Army Canteens.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether it is intended to continue the present tenant system of canteens; whether it is proposed to introduce periodic examination by independent experts on behalf of the War Office; and if, in future, more encouragement will be given to local trade in these cases.

LORD STANLEY: I am not at present in a position to give the hon Member any information on this subject.

MR. TULLY: When will the noble Lord be in a position?

LORD STANLEY: On the earliest possible occasion.

Uganda Railway Rates.

MR. JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the rates charged for bicycles, cricket and tennis bats, spears (tied or packed), and perambulators taken by passengers on the Uganda Railway are the same (1s. 4d. per ton per mile) as those stated in the revised classification of 15th November 1901, as applicable to goods traffic.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The articles mentioned when carried by passenger trains are charged at passenger-luggage rates and not at those applicable to goods traffic.

Income Tax Returns.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it has been brought to his notice that the Inland Revenue officers of the city have asked employers for lists of their employees liable to pay Income Tax and for the amount of their salaries; and will he say whether this course has his sanction.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): All employers are under a statutory obligation to furnish, when asked to do so, a list of those of their employees who are not entitled to exemption from income tax. They are not asked to state the salaries paid, except in the case of public companies. Even then the information is not pressed for, but, unless it be given, it may be necessary to have recourse to estimated, and possibly incorrect, assessments on the employees.

Osborne Estate Bill—Will of Queen Victoria.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will, prior to the Second Reading of the Osborne Estate Bill, lay upon the Table of the House and print and circulate as a Parliamentary Paper, an excerpt from the will of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria in so far as it relates to that estate.

*MR. RITCHIE: The will of the Sovereign is not open to inspection, and so no part of it can be made public. The purport of the Clauses relating to the Osborne estate is recited in the Preamble to the Bill.

Co-operative Societies and Income Tax.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if co-operative societies registered under the Friendly Societies Acts pay taxes on dividends and profits.

*MR. RITCHIE: Societies which comply with the conditions of the Friendly Societies Acts are exempt from Income Tax, provided that they do not assure to any individual a sum of more than £200 or an annuity of more than £30. But I understand that a co-operative society (that is, one for carrying on an industry, trade or business) cannot be registered under the Friendly Societies Acts.

MR. LAMBERT: Do these societies pay the tax on dividends as well as on profits?

*MR. RITCHIE: What societies—friendly or co-operative?

MR. LAMBERT: Friendly.

MR. RITCHIE: Friendly societies do not pay income tax at all if they come under the description I have given.

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

Ordered, that a message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Lord Welby to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee on National Expenditure.—(*Sir James Fergusson.*)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (LONDON) (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the words: '(1) Nothing in this Act shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof: provided that.' "—(*Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

(2.35) MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) hoped that since last evening the Government had reconsidered their position, for it was evident that the words proposed to be left out were surplusage and ought to be omitted, or else they were capable of conveying a meaning not contemplated by the authors of the Clause. In his view they were mere surplusage, because there was nothing in the Act to affect any endowment apart from what was incidentally and necessarily connected with the operation of the Clause itself. If these words remained in the Bill their interpretation might be strained to mean something very much wider than the Government intended. The local education committee might be debarred from holding these inquiries, and if that were not intended, then certainly the words should be struck out. Words of that nature would not have been inserted without a definite meaning, and naturally the authority would seek to find one. The meaning that would probably be assigned to them would be that the local authority was debarred from doing certain work which was really a concomitant of the work they were called upon to perform under this Clause.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) believed that these words were important and desirable, and ought to be retained in the Clause. In common with all who had had an opportunity of observing the working of the schools, he attached the greatest value to the ancient endowments of the country. A Clause of this kind ought not to be inserted in the Bill without again placing on the Statute-book the opinion of Parliament as to the value of these ancient endowments. As he understood the words, the endowments would by then be left over to the Board of Education or Charity Commissioners to deal with them exactly as they now were, and the words proposed to be omitted would secure that neither one side nor the other was prejudiced. He felt the importance of maintaining these endowments and adapting them to the circumstances of the day, and he supported the retention of the words, because he believed that they were consistent with the great principle of the maintenance of the endowments and their adaptation to the circumstances of the age.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said it seemed to him it would be desirable for the Government to substitute the word "power" for "discretion" in the words proposed to be left out. He objected to the word "discretion," because it conferred on the trustees the power to discriminate as to what part of the money of a general trust should be devoted to repairs, and what part to the general education in the school. The word "power" would reserve to the trustees everything they were entitled to have.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he wished to point out to the Committee that it was impossible to separate these words from the second Clause of the Bill as amended by the Government itself. By that Clause the duty of co-ordinating all forms of education was placed on the local education authority, and it appeared to him that if these words were left in they would limit, and, indeed, take away from the local education authorities whatever power to co-ordinate all forms of education might have been given them under the Clause. The Government had always put it forward that their great wish was to co-ordinate education, and inasmuch as Clause 2 was at present in a very lame condition he hoped that on Report an opportunity would be found to strengthen it in that direction. The only argument for the words was that they were surplusage and unmeaning, or, as he ventured to describe them on the preceding night, pompous preamble; and in that case they ought to be struck out. If they had any meaning, it must be to the injury of Clause 2.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) complained that the Government had given them no explanation of the meaning of the words, and said that in his judgment they were very dangerous words. It was understood that whatever income the trustees or managers had for the purpose of maintaining elementary education was to be transferred to the local education authority. But now it was provided that nothing in the Bill was to affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustee, in spite of the fact that in the very next words the Clause proceeded to affect the endowment. If the words were meaningless, they ought to be struck out; if they had any meaning, then they could only operate in a mischievous direction.

Mr. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley) said he had had an opportunity of going through the list of endowments in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and he had found that there was a considerable number of small endowments given specially to the schoolmasters and mistresses of the parish. Would they be taken into account in fixing the salary of the teacher? If so, it appeared to him that the parish would lose the benefit of these endowments. If the local authority had no power of using these endowments, say, for scholarships, and if they were all to be thrown into the hotch-pot, the small parishes would suffer a great loss..

*The SECRETARY of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) said that the salary of the schoolmaster or mistress was a matter for which provision had to be made by the local education authority, and any endowment for that purpose would go to the local authority, and be credited to the parish. The Clause avowedly dealt with the income of endowments, and did not touch the endowments themselves, or interfere with the discretion of the trustees. He believed the words proposed to be omitted were necessary, and would in no way prejudice future recipients of the incomes of the endowments.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that according to the Secretary to the Board of Education, the schoolmaster, in the cases cited by the hon. Member for the Otley Division, would be no better, and education would be no better, for the endowment; but the rates would be relieved.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) asked whether it would be in the competence of trustees to divert a part of the income from the endowment to the upkeep of the school buildings, or to lay it by to accumulate a building fund.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that if it were in the power of the trustees to deal with the money in that way now, it would equally be in their power hereafter. Whoever possessed a discretion in the application of the money would retain the discretion. Where the purposes for which the endowment was designed were met by the local authority, the endowment could be diverted to other purposes.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Then it is in the mind of the Government that part of the income of an ordinary educational endowment may be applied in the future to the up-keep of the fabric.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS: Yes, they said so last night.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that the meaning of the Clause was at last clear. Although he had read it repeatedly without getting an idea of its real meaning, he did at last get some glimmering, because the hon. Member for Tunbridge supported it, and thereby showed that it must have some thing to do with religious or sectarian educational endowments. The local authority, with the rates behind it, would always provide adequately for elementary education, and, therefore, the question was whether the endowment could be set free for the relief of rates, by being diverted to the maintenance of the fabric and the Sunday school. The Prime Minister appeared to dissent, but that was the only interpretation he could place on the words of the Secretary to the Board of Education when he told them that if secular education were adequately provided for by the local authority, the trustees would have unlimited discretion to use the money for purposes for which the local authority was not responsible. As that authority would have an inexhaustible fund in the form of the rates at its back, it would certainly be able to make adequate provision, and would not need to fall back on the endowments. That being so, the trustees would have discretion to use them for other than educational purposes, although they had been left for the general instruction of the poor of the parish, and he ventured to assert that any such diversion would mean confiscating endowments given to the poor for the benefit of the richest church in the parish. He could only describe it as a gross act of confiscation, and the intention to permit it was not even disclosed by the Government until the guillotine had been fixed. They had had no time to consider it, for the knife was falling, and they could hear its clang; and under such embarrassing and unnerving circumstances they were unable to give proper attention to so far-reaching a proposal.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) said the arguments which had been put forward obviously had no relation to the words the Committee was considering, for the only meaning of the words was to leave the trustees with the discretion which the trust deed gave them.

*(3.0.) MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said the original bargain made by the Government was that the denominational managers were to bear the cost of structural repairs. Now there was another proposal that the local authority should pay the rent of the master's house, of which they heard nothing before. On that side an Amendment was put down that those School Board parishes which had built masters' houses out of loans should also have this contribution, but the Government closured that Amendment. Now they had another revelation to the effect that the trustees were to have a discretion to spend on repairs money which had been left for the education of the children. The result would be that there would be no bargain at all; the denominational managers would get everything, and people who had left money to benefit the parish would have their money twisted and diverted to denominational purposes. There had recently been published in Warwickshire a list of educational endowments, and the gentleman who prepared it said that there were sixty-five parishes altogether, and in a great many of them the masters' houses, school buildings, as well as the endowments, had been left simply for the purpose of educating the children of the village independently of the Church altogether.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that as regarded the discretion of the managers he had stated early in the debate that where the managers had a discretion under the terms of the trust they could exercise it for the benefit of the school. They were bound by the terms of the trust to use the endowment for the benefit of the school, and if they found that certain purposes were adequately met by the local authority, then they might use the money in their hands for other purposes for which the local authority was not responsible, and for which they were responsible, but which were just as essential for the education of the parish as the supply of teachers and other purposes. Surely they had heard enough of the scandalous condition of the school buildings in many country districts. He ventured to say last night that he thought the managers would do not merely a justifiable but a very proper thing if they put all the money they had over in one year away for purposes for which it was not immediately required in order to establish a building fund with a view to an improvement of the school buildings in the future. He did not believe hon. Members opposite would dispute for a moment that that was a most important educational purpose, and would be entirely in consonance with the wishes of the founders.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he was afraid that a good many hon. Members did not know what the Clause meant. They had had a definite utterance from the hon. Baronet the Member for Preston, who said that the discretion of the trustees meant what was contained in the trust deeds. The Secretary to the

Board of Education now said that it meant the discretion of the trustees to apply certain money for what they considered to be proper educational purposes, and if they considered that the educational purposes were properly supplied by the local authority, then they could use their discretion with reference to the disposal of the money within the terms of the trust deed. But by this Bill the education authority was bound to supply all the educational requirements, and therefore wherever there was an endowment given for the general support of the school, or to be devoted to general education, they gave the managers the first grip of that money for the purpose of doing the repairs, or else of laying it by for building purposes. Suppose they had an income of £50 from an endowment in perfectly general terms for the general support of the school, or to be devoted generally for the purposes of education. If only £20 were necessary the managers could take that £20 and say, "We have a discretion in this matter, and we will place the other £30 to a building fund to be used next year." That was the meaning of this Clause. That was the reason for the alteration of this Clause. The Bishop of London shed some light upon this question at the recent meeting in the Albert Hall. He said that the weak spot of their bargain was the repairs, and he implored them to try what they could do in the House of Lords to deal with this difficulty.

> "What a terrible thing it would be," said the Bishop, "if many schools were compelled to close their doors from sheer inability to meet their expenses after all this trouble and care with reference to the Education Bill."

He thought that speech furnished the reason for the Clause. The bargain was now being departed from. The real meaning of this Clause was that they wanted to give the managers the right to put their hands into the endowments in order to relieve them of a burden which they pretended ought to be placed upon them by this Bill.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said that charities and endowments had been diverted from their original channels, and had been used in support of voluntary schools. He could give as an instance the Towyn Charity, which was in no way a Church charity, which had for many years been used to carry on Church schools. This charity was originally left for the poor, but there being practically no poor in that small township for which it was left, the Commissioners, by a decree, diverted it to two Church schools. The Joint Education Committee drafted a scheme which the Charity Commissioners printed and approved of. It went on to the Education Department, and while it was there the Duke of Devonshire was petitioned by the clergy not to proceed with the publication of the scheme, and he yielded. Consequently the children had had no benefit, but the clergy simply had to find £40 less. There was no mention in the Bill of such income, and if it was not dealt with the result would be that the parsons would still be getting £40 per annum, which presumably they might use as they pleased for either maintenance or repairs. It would be a shame if parsons were allowed to receive endowments intended for the poor and utilise them for purposes which in no way benefited the public.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There appear to be some extraordinary misconceptions about this Clause. The hon. Gentleman opposite has quoted the speech of the Bishop of London, and mentioned something about a bargain. I know nothing about any such bargain. I have made no bargain, and that is a phrase which I absolutely decline to recognise. This proposal deals with endowments, and the whole object of the Clause is to make provision in the case where the existing endowment makes no provision. Where the existing endowment makes provision we leave the discretion wholly unaltered, but it is possible under the Bill that a case may arise with which it is impossible for the trustees to deal, and we therefore provide in this Clause a very simple remedy to deal with it. If the trust deeds give the discretion now to distribute the money they retain it, and if they have not got it we give it to them. The hon. Member asks whether this Bill is intended to restore to the public or the poor or to the rich money which has been improperly diverted. If it has been improperly diverted go to the Law Courts and get it put right. This Bill is not intended to survey and reform, so far as reform is required, the whole field of endowments. Other Acts have been passed for the purpose. All we do is not in any sense to revise endowments, but to meet the single case in which the discretion bestowed by law in the trust deeds is interfered with under the Bill.

MR. BRYCE pointed out that the Bill now made new provision out of the public funds for purposes which the endowments formerly served. That changed the whole thing and put a new face upon it. It enabled the trustees to divert funds which were given for education to the relief of, what? In the first place, of the rates, or, if they pleased, of the subscribers. This was the natural result of this Clause. The object of this proposal was to divert endowments given for the education of the poor and apply them for the relief of the rich.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) hoped that as a mere Scotchman he would be pardoned for intervening in an English debate, but what he desired was information as to the number of schools affected by the discussion in progress. Judging by the anxiety displayed by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs and the hon. and learned Member below him, one would think that if not the whole, at any rate the great majority, of the voluntary schools in this country were endowed. He understood that was not so; that out of 14,750 schools or thereabouts only some 2,200 had any endowments at all, therefore upwards of 12,000 schools would still require to provide all repairs out of absolute subscriptions. Then, again, of the 2,200 schools, a certain proportion had their endowments specially devoted to various objects, which would mean the handing of these endowments over to the local education authority, so that when all was said and done the question under discussion only related to a small minority of the schools, and again, in most of these cases, the endowments were of the most paltry description—only a few pounds in many cases. He did not think, therefore, that the evil was widespread, or that the Government merited the condemnation that had been showered upon them.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said he wished to call the attention of the Secretary of the Education Department to two charities which were referred to in the reports made to the Charity Commissioners in connection with an inquiry held in every parish wholly or partly within the administrative county of Durham, into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894. He would read the statements of the purposes for which they were left. Those cases would afford an object lesson to show what the Government really meant. The first case was referred to in these terms:—

> "From the recitals in a Bond bearing date 12th October, 1691, it appears that the Rev. Henry Greswold gave £100 to John Raine, Henry Eden, Cuthbert Swainston and Cuthbert Raine, to be laid out in the purchase of lands or an annuity, the profits to be paid towards a yearly salary for the schoolmaster of Gainford, for teaching the poor children of the said parish.... For this payment [the yearly interest] the schoolmaster instructs in reading, writing, and accounts, six children recommended by the churchwardens, from any part of the parish, exclusively of the chapelry of Barnard Castle."

He asked the Secretary of the Board of Education to state whether this money, which was left for a specific purpose, would now be devoted to the repair or renovation of the school. If it was justly applied in harmony with the view of the donor it ought to be applied to the teacher's salary. The other case referred to in the report was as follows:—

> "William Dent, the elder of Brightwell, in the county of Berkshire, clockmaker, by Indenture of Lease and Release, dated 29th and 30th April, 1706, assigned, released and confirmed to John Dent and William Dent the younger, their heirs and assigns, two several messuages or tenements and premises, situate in Cost Street, within the parish of Stepney, and County of Middlesex, in trust, for the educating of such poor boys as should be born in the town of Barnard Castle, in the bishopric of Durham, with power to sell the same premises, and to lay out the produce of such sale in purchasing other houses or lands of the like value in the county of York or bishopric of Durham. . . . The sum of £133 is now in the hands of Miss Lee of Staindrop, daughter of the late Sir John Lee, into whose hands it probably came as connected with the family of Huchinson. Miss Lee pays £5 6s. 8d. yearly, as the interest. For many years she paid this sum to William Lonsdale, a private schoolmaster in Barnard Castle, teaching in his own house, for which he taught ten boys free. For the last three or four years Lonsdale has been unable to teach school, and Miss Lee has

paid the same yearly sum to the treasurer of the National School in Barnard Castle, where ten children, named by the minister and churchwarden, are taught free of any charge."

He wished to know how the money in this case was now to be applied. The Report from which he had quoted was full of similar cases. On what principle of justice was the money to be diverted from the purpose for which it was originally left?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the very object of this Clause was to prevent the money from being diverted. The obligations of the trustees remained just where they were. The hon. Gentleman need not be in any alarm that the Clause would divert any money from the purposes for which they were intended.

MR. JOHN WILSON asked the right hon. Gentleman to elaborate the answer and make it plainer. Would he state to what purpose these endowments would be devoted?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would be quite impossible and quite improper to answer that question here. It will rest with the Courts of Law to decide whether the money is being properly applied in case of dispute as to any particular trust. It would be perfectly monstrous for us to give any statement on the subject. All that we can do is to leave the trusts as they are.

SIR H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): This is a very old controversy. We are quite familiar with it in the country to which the hon. Member for the Kilmarnock Burghs and I belong. We have had a great deal to do with this very question. The right hon. Gentleman says there is no proposal to divert money from the original purpose, but the case is this. The circumstances are changed by your legislation. Supposing a pious founder leaves a large sum of money for a certain public purpose, which is otherwise not provided for in the parish, that goes on for a great many years, then Parliament says this public purpose shall be the duty of the whole community, and it is so enacted. This public duty is imposed on the whole community throughout the country. What, then, is the effect on the endowment which was given for this particular parish? Simply to relieve the community of the duty which Parliament thinks, and which, by the law of the land, ought to be placed upon them. But in this case there are two different classes of people who will contribute to the maintenance of the school. There are the ratepayers who are for the first time introduced under this Bill, and the other parties to the matter are the denominational subscribers—managers, or whatever you may call them. If there is to be adequate provision by the local education authority for secular education, for the ordinary maintenance of education, and for the maintenance of the school, and if that is prescribed by the Act for all the country in similar cases, then what is to be done with this money? We are told now that it should be handed over to the subscribers to relieve them of the duty [Cries of "No" and "Hear, hear!"] which they undertook, and upon their undertaking of which they have been allowed to have the influence they have in this educational matter. The right hon. Gentleman has always been talking of the scheme of the Bill. The scheme of the Bill is this, that because the fabric of the school building belongs in certain cases—some of us don't admit so much—to a Church, therefore that Church is entitled to a certain standing in the administration of the education of the parish, and is entitled to enforce its particular views. That is the whole scheme of the Bill, but if that power is continued or conferred upon the Church and subscribers, and then if the endowments are employed for the purpose of relieving them of some of the obligations they have incurred, you *ipso facto* invalidate the bargain, notwithstanding what the right hon. Gentleman has said, and the condition on which the whole Bill rests, so far as elementary education is concerned. The right hon. Gentleman has said that this Clause is not to divert endowments, but to continue things as they were. You may continue things as they were, in one sense, but the circumstances to which those arrangements applied have totally changed or passed away.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said he had some sympathy with the Bishop of London, who was under the impression that he had made a bargain. It showed the danger Spiritual Peers might fall into when they spoke in commercial metaphors. The real essence of the matter was this. There was £120,000 of public money to be given for public purposes in those different parishes. Under this Bill, the circumstances would be entirely different. It was quite true that in future they would be devoted to educational purposes, on the basis that the Church of England got four-sixths of the management For this it would contribute the building rent free, and keep it in repair. His complaint was that this public education money in future would be used for private denominational ends. If the Church people made a bargain, let them keep it. The Parliamentary Secretary said they could put their money by. Yes, but don't let them put by public money. This was a very important matter. It was another example of how the Church of England was going back upon its bargain. They had got all that they bargained for, but they were not giving all they bargained to give. He thought if the Committee had a free hand they would be anxious that this public money should not serve denominational ends, as it did under the Clause as it stood.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said that so far as he knew the denominational managers repudiated the idea that they had entered into any bargain. What they said was that terms had been imposed on them by the Government, and they thought the terms were hard. They were not satisfied with them at first. and they were not satisfied with them now.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs), called attention to a charity in a parish which he knew, the greater part of which was to be devoted to educational purposes. It was originally founded by a Nonconformist, but it had now, after being in the Court of Chancery, become connected with the Church of England. In that case, what was to be done with the money? How was the money to be spent for educational purposes? The county would be responsible for maintaining the school, and that being so, the money should only be used for repair of the school building, which would not be required for twenty or thirty years. The population was not likely to increase, and the money would accumulate. Surely it was most unfair that in regard to a great number of parishes the money should be used for relieving existing subscribers. If his right hon. friend went to a division he would support him.

(3.30.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 172; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 542.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, RtHn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Ashton Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, SirT.R. (TowerHamlets)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHnSirJ. (Manch'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (WarwickS. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirE. W(B'rySEdm'nds
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard (Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw. H
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Maxwell Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'wn
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myres, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon John (Montrose
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(3.43.) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he wished to move, as an Amendment, "Provided that no part of the income of the endowment should b devoted to the payment of such repairs as under this Act are to be paid by the managers, provided also that."

*The CHAIRMAN said that the Amendment of the hon. Member was really an objection to the whole Clause. The object of the Clause was to enable the money to be used for "other purposes," and it had been discussed the previous day and this day on that ground.

Mr. BRYCE said that surely there were many other purposes covered by the words besides that purpose—such as scholarships or improvements in the school in other ways.

*The CHAIRMAN said that the proposed Amendment raised the point which they had been discussing for two days.

Mr. BRYCE said that what they had been discussing were the possibilities of the application of the money to other purposes, among which repairs might find a place. But it was not in the Clause; it was merely suggested that the trustees at their discretion might spend the money on something besides repairs.

*The CHAIRMAN said that the discussion ranged round the point that part of the money might be used by the trustees for the purpose of forming a building fund. Now the hon. Member for North West Norfolk proposed to say that no part of the money should be used for hat purpose.

Mr. BRYCE said that many of the endowments were of considerable amount—much larger than could be exhausted by repairs—and, therefore, it was clear that they must refer to many cases besides repairs.

*The CHAIRMAN: Then, under the Clause, the balance will go to the local education authority. The money will be apportioned between the local education authority and certain expenses which the managers will have to incur; and the only expenses they will have to incur will be for the upkeep of the school buildings.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE said that the Government did not understand the Clause in that way, because, instead of handing the money over to the local education authority, the managers claimed to have the right to retain it.

*The CHAIRMAN: I cannot conceive any discussion on the hon. Member's Amendment which would differ in the slightest degree from the discussion the Committee has had.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE said he quite agreed as far as the discussion was concerned; but he presented a concrete proposal.

*The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept a number of Amendments raising the same point.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) asked if it was not a point of whether the Chair was to rule in this House or not.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said that the managers might wish to have a better equipment than the county authority deemed themselves justified in sanctioning. In that and other ways, the managers might desire to spend the money.

*The CHAIRMAN: It is possible that the words of the hon. Member's Amendment may be better than the words of the Amendment which has been rejected. It is not, however, for me to choose. All I say is that it appears to me that a discussion on the hon. Member's Amendment must cover precisely the same ground which has been already covered: and, for that reason, I am obliged to rule the Amendment out of order.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said the Amendment he desired to move was short, was easily understood, and had not been covered by any previous discussion. It was to insert in line 2, after "where" the words "after the first day of January, 1901." His object was to fix the trust deeds and the provisions affecting endowments in the condition in which they were on January 1st, 1901. He moved his Amendment for this reason. During the course of last year the Bill was being negotiated by the bishops and Convocation on the one hand and the Government on the other. It was perfectly fair to say that the Bill was on the *tapis* during the whole of last year; and, therefore, the matter ought to be discussed from the position in which it was at the beginning of last year. That was why he proposed to fix a date. He might be asked why he put in any limiting words at all, and he would answer that it was because of the speech of the Bishop of London on Friday last. Hon. Members who wished to understand the inner workings of the Bill should read the speeches of the Bishop of London, the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, and others at the Albert Hall meeting. The Bishop was dealing with the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, and he said he had been advised by competent authority—the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich let the cat out of the bag by saying that he had been advised by the Government—that the trust deeds would not be changed, and that, where there was an appeal to the bishops, that appeal would still lie. Then the Lord Bishop said that he pressed that schools which had no trust deeds should have an opportunity of having trust deeds on the lines of the old trust deeds, before the Bill came into operation. The suggestion of the Bishop was that there should be new trust deeds, or altered trust deeds, in order that there might be an appeal to the bishops; but he thought that trust deeds ought not to be altered with a view to this Bill. They ought to remain as they were before the Bill was introduced. It might be said that a trust deed could not be altered. In many cases trust deeds could not be altered; but in cases where the donor was still alive they could, in certain circumstances, be altered. They ought, however, to take the position as it was on the 1st January, 1901, without any manipulation of the trust deeds; and no opportunity should be given of altering the *status quo* with a view to legislation.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'where,' to insert the words 'on the first day of January, nineteen hundred and one.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the hon. Gentleman had discussed the speech of the Bishop of London, the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman for the Newport Division of Shropshire, and the Albert Hall meeting; but he had not said much with regard to the new Clause, which had nothing whatever to do with the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. The hon. Gentleman seemed to think that it was within the power of anyone, after a trust had been founded, to alter it at a moment's notice.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said his statement was directly opposite to that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not think that there was any case in which the deed could be altered, and, in cases where the deed could not be altered, the hon. Gentleman admitted that his Amendment was unnecessary. He presumed the Bishop of London was referring to cases where there were no trust deeds; but, whether he was or was not, the Bishop was not a legal authority, and never posed as a legal authority. He was not aware that it was possible in any case to alter a trust deed, unless there was a provision in it enabling a modification to be made. If there were such a provision it ought to remain. He doubted whether there was any such case; but supposing it was theoretically possible for a man to put money in trust with a provision enabling him to alter the trust deed, it should remain in that modification. If a donor deliberately intended that he should have power to modify the trust, why should he be deprived of that power? If no such power were embodied in a trust, then the trust could not be altered, and the hon. Gentlemen's Amendment would have no practical effect. In these circumstances he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press it further.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not think that the Amendment would be so futile in its character as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine. Analogous cases arose under the Burials Act. It very often happened that a piece of land was given by the squire of the parish for educational purposes, or as a burial ground. A deed was not prepared, because it was not regarded as necessary; and the ground was utilised for the purpose for which it was given. Then an Act of Parliament was introduced, which was regarded as curtailing the privileges and prerogatives of the clergy of the parish. They discovered that there was no trust deed; and they went to the donor or his heir and said: "Will you make a trust deed in the form we require?" He would give a case in point, which came before the Court of Appeal, and, therefore, the facts were judicially established. A piece of land was given for burial purposes; no trust deed was prepared, as it was not regarded as necessary; and a great deal of parochial money was expended in fencing. The Burials Act came in, and the clergyman of the parish went to the landowner and said: "We want a trust deed;" and a trust deed was prepared, under which the Dean of Bangor, the Archdeacon of the district, and the rural Dean deprived the parish of the property on which parochial money had been spent. What was to prevent similar transactions being carried out under the present Bill? He had been examining the Charity Commissioners' report on charities in Wales; and he found—he would not say the majority, but a great number—of trusts for educational purposes had no deeds at all, because they were not regarded as necessary. Now that the time had come for carrying out the suggestion of the Bishop of London, the Prime Minister had repudiated it. The right hon. Gentleman came down to the House, and, in a speech which was made after advice, said that this was the authentic interpretation of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause—that they must get new trust deeds. That was what the Government wanted, and what had been done in several cases until it was stopped by the Courts of Law. What had been done with regard to the Burials Acts could be done with regard to these endowments. The Government were prepared to take "first use and wont" with regard to these endowments for their own purposes, and those opposed to the Government wished to do the same for their purposes. If these endowments had been devoted to educational purposes, why should they be diverted into another channel now? After all, the landowner was the arbiter; he could direct at any time what the trust should be. He simply had to say to the clergyman: "We want a trust deed," and the clergyman had it drawn as he wished. The local squire knew perfectly well that if in the future the endowment was used for the repair of the fabric and for building, he would be relieved in pocket *pro tanto*, and he naturally would prefer to see it used for that purpose. What they wished was that it should be made impossible for the trust to be diverted from the purpose for which it was originally intended. He knew of one endowment which was given for education, reading and writing, and "teaching Christian principles." It was a sectarian endowment. The Christian principles meant in that case the principles of the Church of England, but reading and writing came first. What would happen now? There was no trust deed, but the Squire, who represented the original donor, would soon discover that it was necessary to have a trust deed. He would have the bishop's sanction. The Bishop of London would tell him he must do it, and everyone in the Church of England obeyed the Bishop except the clergy, and although reading and writing were put first in that endowment it would all be used in the future for the repair of the fabric and for setting up a Church of England Sunday school. The ratepayer would be no better off. So long as the ratepayers were not bankrupt the rate could be used for repairing the fabric. Where were the agricultural objectors? They were constantly talking about the burdens on the rates, and here they were allowing endowments to the extent of £120,000 to be taken away from the relief of the rates for a purely sectarian purpose. But no one had any confidence in the agricultural party since, if he might use the phrase without any Parliamentary breach of order, Mr. Chaplin's flying squadron of agriculturists ran away on the fight of the one half or one quarter. The agricultural party would see now that the rates were used to keep up the fabric, and the farmer, who was so heavily burdened by the rates, would see this £120,000 devoted to what were called Christian principles, and reading and writing would be left to take care of themselves.

(4.8.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 100; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 543.)

AYES.

Abraham William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley. Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hon. John (Montrose
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell,
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Samuel Evans and
Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Agustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn C. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,RtHon.WilliamEdw,H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M‘Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ridley,Hon.M.W(Stalybridge
Ritchie,RtHon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Round, Right Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G.Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel, C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse,Rt.Hon.E.R.(Bath
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

(4.21) MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) moved the substitution of the words "original trusts" for the words "trusts or other provisions." The object of the Amendment was to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and at the same time to prevent Cæsar annexing the property of other people. Many elementary denominational schools enjoyed incomes from charities to which they were not entitled by the terms of the trust deeds. The position had arisen through the partial or total failure of the objects of the trust. When such a failure happened the trustees went to the Charity Commissioners for a scheme, and usually the education of the district was decided upon as being a laudable object to which the money might be devoted. In days gone by, the Charity Commissioners, when maturing schemes with regard to trusts of that nature, had been more influenced by the question of education than by denominational zeal; otherwise, instead of giving the money to the managers, they would have given it direct to the rector and the churchwardens. But if the Clause were carried in its present form, the income arising from such trusts would be divided into two portions, one going to the maintenance of the school, and the other being claimed by the manager for the repairs. That, in his opinion, would be an entirely improper state of affairs, because it had to be remembered that all the money spent by the managers under the Bill would be spent on denominational purposes, whereas the money under these trusts was not originally left for such purposes. By this Clause the aim of the pious founder would not be carried out, nor would the schemes of the Charity Commissioners be strictly complied with. When these schemes were framed, the Charity Commissioners could not possibly have anticipated that the whole of the maintenance of the elementary schools would be paid out of public funds; therefore it was not fair that the income from these trusts should be divided in the manner he had indicated. Since 1870, all such trusts had been devoted to secondary education, but prior to 1870 there were a great many applied to elementary education. He could not say the amount of money that was involved, as the Charity Commissioners were too busy to supply a Return, but that was simply another instance of the way in which the Committee were legislating in the dark on this Bill. The proposal of the Government afforded a further illustration of the efforts of the denominations to get hold of money out of the public purse. They had been foiled in their attempts to get the school fees, and to avoid their liability for the repairs of the schoolhouse, but they had succeeded in getting the rents of the schoolmasters' houses towards the cost of repairs, and he was afraid that under this Clause they would succeed in getting for denominational purposes money which was never intended to be so used.

Amendment proposed.—

" In line 2, to leave out the words 'trusts or other provisions,' and insert the words 'original trusts.' "—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that if he rightly understood the object of the hon. Member's Amendment it was of a somewhat alarming character. It was proposed to go behind the Charity Commissioners and the Education Department for the last thirty or thirty-three years, to rip up all the schemes made in that period, and, so far as was possible to work the schemes of the original trusts into the arrangement of this Clause. He really thought it a monstrous proposition. He could not at the moment state the amount of money involved, but there were at least 1500 elementary schools working under schemes made since 1869; and the proposition that at this period of the discussion, and in a Bill already so large and complicated, they should undo the work of the Commissioners who had been working all this time for the benefit of education, was one which he could hardly think the hon. Member was serious in putting before the Committee.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that this alarming proposition was contained in the Clause which they were now discussing, for it proposed in the case of all those elementary schools to rip up the schemes and alter them to the extent suggested under this Clause. The hon. Member was proposing now to do something which was quite different to the schemes under the Charity Commissioners —and this proposal was merely an Amendment of the scheme suggested by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board of Education in his own Clause. He did not think the hon. Gentleman had done justice to the Amendment moved by his hon. friend. Hitherto the Charity Commissioners had been called in to make new schemes where others had failed, but now it appeared that the schemes of the Charity Commissioners had also failed and it was necessary to provide something fresh. His hon. friend asked that in making this fresh provision they should go back again to the intentions of the pious founders and not hold themselves bound by the schemes of the Charity Commissioners. To those who looked upon the public interest and the interest of the Church of England as one and the same thing, an Amendment of this sort, of course, would not commend itself, but they ought to look to the public interest apart from the Church of England. They should ask that these trusts, intended to further some public object, now that they were being ripped up, should once again be considered, and, having regard to the intentions of the pious founders, should be used for some public interest and not necessarily for the Church of England interest. Where the Church of England had been the sole supporter of education in a parish this might be reasonable, but the Church of England no longer occupied that position, because the public had come in, and it was, therefore, reasonable that the trusts should be reconsidered and devoted to purposes purely public.

DR. MACNAMARA said he found himself in complete disagreement with the Amendment of his hon. friend. The effect of this Amendment would be to go back to the original schemes, and in many cases the original purposes of the trusts had fallen into desuetude. The Charity Commissioners, although he did not agree with all they did, had modernised the trusts on fairly common-sense lines, and the bulk of the money affected was now applied to the purposes of education. Therefore, to go back to the original purposes seemed to him to be not a very practical proposal and it would rob elementary education of something like £100,000 a year. That being so he could not support the Amendment.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he agreed with the Amendment of his hon. friend in favour of the pious founders. They said that this money should be given to the poor. If they diverted this money into its original channel, where did they rob education? All they said was that the ratepayers who could afford to pay should bear the burden of education; and that, to the extent to which they lost the endowment, that money should be made up out of the rates. On the other hand they would be giving by this Amendment to the people who could not afford to pay rates—that was the poorest of the poor in the district—money which was originally given to ameliorate their misery. Take the case of the charity he had referred to, given for the purpose of erecting cottages for the poor. By some mysterious process the Charity Commissioners had diverted that money to pay a sewing mistress. That was no doubt an excellent purpose, but it was not the object for which the charity was established. What would happen under this Amendment? They would get back to the old principle of cottage homes. Would the sewing class suffer? No, for it would be just the reverse, because the rates would pay for a sewing mistress. Why did his hon. friend wish to rob the poor in Wales for the purpose of providing sewing mistresses, or for any other purpose? He stood for the pious founders in this matter. He had got an excellent authority in this matter, namely, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley, who some time ago denounced a similar proposal to the one now made by the Government as one which was using money originally given for the poor for the establishment of scholarships and schools; and the right hon. Gentleman went on to say that this was simply robbing the poor. And the right hon. Gentleman the Member of Bordesley was right. He was then denouncing the utilisation of money given for the poor for the purposes of scholastic institutions. He said those charities were the private property of the poor of the country, and if they could show that one single farthing of that money was applied to other purposes it was a robbery of the poor. Now the Government were promoting a Bill for the robbery of the poor. This money was not given for the church organ or for sewing mistresses, or for relieving the rich subscribers to voluntary schools, but for the purposes of the poor, and this proposal now made by the Government was one of the schemes denounced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley as a gross robbery of the poor. A good many of these endowments included sites and property allotted by the Enclosure Commissioners under the Allotments Act. He knew a case of that kind where the site given was common land which the poor of the parish had a right and freehold in. That land was given for the purpose of a school, in trust. That was not a school for any sect or denomination, but for the whole parish. What was done with it? A deed was prepared for it under which it was given to the National Society. This was property which belonged to the whole parish. A Committee of Management was set up, all of whom had to be members of the Church of England. That was an instance of the diversion of trust property from its original purpose. He did not say anything about the particular form of the Amendment, but he was voting for the substance, and he did not cavil at the words of the Amendment like the hon. Member for North Camberwell. His leader in this matter was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley, and acting upon the great principles he had laid down in this House, he proposed to go into the Lobby to support the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Mr. BRYCE said he did not think his hon. friends were right in supposing that there were many cases in which endowments had been diverted from educational purposes. The Amendment was really directed to cases in which the Charity Commissioners' schemes had sectarianised trusts when this was not intended by the founders. It was from that point of view that he proposed to support the Amendment. It was very difficult for him to raise the question conveniently upon this Amendment, but that was the fault of the conditions under which they were discussing this Bill. If they had had any prospect of dealing with this question by another Clause they would have done so. They had to take such chances as the indulgence of an autocratic Government gave to them, and his hon. friend had taken this opportunity with his Amendment, which submitted to the Committee the fact that there were a good many trusts intended for the parish generally which had been made sectarian in their character. If the Government would propose another Amendment dealing with this injustice, he believed his hon. friend would be willing to withdraw his Amendment, but if they persisted in this *non possumus* then he would have to divide the Committee.

MR. LOGAN (Leicestershire, Harborough) asked the hon. Member not to press the Amendment. It was really not a practical Amendment. He was on a committee that administered an endowment in so far as it related to school purposes, the scheme under which they acted having been sanctioned seven or eight years ago by the Charity Commissioners. If the money were to go to the poor a great deal might be said for that, although he was inclined to think that the best plan was to pay the poor good wages so that they might be able to find various things for themselves. But that would not be the effect of the Amendment. The pious donor was a very ambitious man, and he believed that it was possible to found a cathedral in a place which had about 300 inhabitants, and he also desired to found a university of music. Therefore if his hon. friend's Amendment were carried the money would have to be diverted to the insane idea of building a cathedral and establishing a university of music in that small place.

MR. SOARES said his hon. friend did not quite understand the Amendment. In cases where the original object of a trust had been extinguished what would happen would be this. The Charity Commissioners would have to formulate a new scheme which would not be sectarian or denominational. If the Government would give any indication that they would re-consider the matter he would not divide the Committee, but if he got an absolute *non possumus* he would take the vote.

(4.48.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 218; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 544.).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Col. James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh'e)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn, Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W

Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St.Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirEW(B'rysS.Edm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon.Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
MiddlemoreJohnThrogmorton
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir FrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,RtHon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler,Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,M.H.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson,SirWilliamEdw.M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-ColA.C.E(Taunton
Wharton,Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley,Rt.Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William(Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William(Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. Morley
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer,SirCharlesM(Durham)
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James

Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
Sandys,Lieut.-Col.Thos.Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Soares and Mr. Charles Allen.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said the proviso put down by the Government meant that there should be no opportunity for the Board of Education or the local authority to come in unless there was in the trust deed power to spend the money, either in whole or in part, for purposes for which the local authority was liable to pay. It retained to the benefit of the managers that very large class of trust funds under trust deeds which were general in their terms. He could not think that it was the intention of the Government to hand over that large class of trust funds entirely to the discretion of the trustees. If in line three the word "must" was retained instead of "may," it came to this, that whenever a trust gave power to the trustees to apply part or all the income in the payment of the salaries of the teachers or the fees of scholars at any time in connection with the maintenance of the school as distinguished from the repair of the fabric—in these cases there should be a proper inquiry at which the County Council should have something to say as to what they thought would be a proper distribution of the money—the final decision, of course, resting with the Board of Education. The Secretary to the Board of Education had laid down the monstrous doctrine that whenever the least discretion was left to the trustees, say of an income of £100, for the education of the poor in such and such a parish, the trustees could withhold the whole of that money except the small sum for the education of the poor children of the parish. All he wanted was that the County Council should be heard on the one side, and the trustees on the other, the Board of Education being the umpire. He begged the Government and the Committee to consider the Amendment in a favourable spirit. He was quite sure that what he desired to do in the matter of trust funds was to do fair justice to the trustees on the one hand and the county authority on the other. He begged to move as an Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'must,' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'must' stand part of the Clause."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that the Amendment really went back on a matter which had already been discussed and which the Committee had decided some time ago. The object of the whole Clause was to keep endowments in their present condition, giving to any body of trustees who had a discretion the right to retain that discretion, but also taking care that where there was no discretion the money should go in such direction as had been indicated in the trust deed. The hon. Member proposed in every case that the Board of Education should determine in what proportions the sum of money should be spent, partly for the purposes of the local authority, and partly on those of the managers. The Amendment ran counter to the intentions of the Government and could not be accepted. If the money was being improperly hoarded by the managers, there where sufficient means of making them account for it.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT said that this was only another illustration of the method by which the Government were dealing with this question. In the case of endowments where the trustees were fettered and must give the money to the repair of buildings, then the Government did not desire to interfere; but where there was a discretion, the Government came in and enabled the trustees to help educational work in the parish if they chose to do so. His hon. friend said that there were many cases where the trustees were not obliged to use the money for purposes of the voluntary schools, and these trustees should be brought under the same conditions as the class of trustees who were forced to divide.

(5.13) Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 221; Noes, 105. (Division List, No. 545.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick, N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C. (N'th'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry

Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount

Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sh'ffi'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Cl.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald

Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brown, GeorgeM. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Grey, Rt. Hon.Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon.SirArthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James

Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,CharlesEdward(Stafford
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Thomas,F. Freeman-(Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George (York,W.R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whitley and Mr. Corrie Grant.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said the object of the Amendment he now proposed to move was to limit the portion of the income from the endowment which was to be paid to the managers, to what he might call the religious or sectarian purposes of the endowment. Such an Amendment, he maintained, was in consonance with the original intentions of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the portion of the income which was applicable to teaching religious subjects alone would not be touched. As he understood, the cost of repairs was to be a burden on the managers for ever, in consideration of the benefits they were to receive under this Bill, but if there was found a trust deed telling the managers that a portion or all the income from the endowment was to go to sectarian purposes, it ought not to be taken away from them. Supposing a Roman Catholic donor gave a certain sum by way of an endowment to a school, with a trust providing that the money was to be given for religious instruction only, that was an endowment which could not be touched. But he asked the Committee to say that no further funds should flow into the same channel, and that the portion of an endowment which the founder intended to be devoted to giving ordinary elementary education should be placed in the hands of those who must now provide this education. The result of his Amendment, if carried, as he submitted it ought to be, would be that all the words after the word "applied" in sub-Clause 1, would be omitted. He apologised for the Amendment not being on the Paper, but that was not his fault. Only some twenty-five minutes was available on the previous day for considering this new Clause and drafting Amendments to it, and he had not been able to draft his in time to get it placed upon the Paper. He had, however, handed it in at two o'clock this afternoon, and he hoped its not appearing on the Paper would not be a difficulty in the way of its being accepted.

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 4, to leave out the words from the word 'applied,' to the word 'Education,' in line 11, inclusive, and insert the words 'by the express provisions of the trust in whole or in part exclusively for the purpose of giving instruction in religious subjects in a public elementary school and for no other purpose; the income or part thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the managers for that purpose, and in all other cases, and subject thereto, the income or the residue thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the education authority."—*Mr. Samuel Evans.*

Question proposed, "That the words 'in whole or in part for' stand part of the Clause."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said he did not think the hon. Gentleman could be really serious in his proposal. Under the Bill it was one of the duties of the managers to provide the school-house, and so on. The words "maintenance of the school," when used in a trust deed, were used — not in a narrow, technical sense, but to mean the general up-keep and educational improvement of the school. Surely the fabric was a part of the liabilities thrown upon the managers; and if they were to maintain the school, understanding the phrase in its general sense, the words allowed the trustees the discretion of using the endowment for the building if the money was wanted. What was the meaning of the Amendment? It was that whatever the intention of the donor or the terms of the trust, no money was to be used for the fabric. Money specifically intended by the donor for the fabric, or generally described under the term maintenance, was to be given to the local authority. The Amendment, he thought, overrode the trust deed in a way which was contrary to the spirit and meaning of the Clause proposed by the Government, and, therefore, it could not be accepted.

Mr. M'KENNA said the Amendment was a preface to the first words of the Clause—

> "Nothing in this Act shall affect any endowment, or the discretion of any trustees in respect thereof."

It did not limit them; what the Amendment proposed was simply this, that the onus of proof should be placed on the managers to show that the endowment was for religious instruction, instead of, as now, the onus of proof being on the education authority to show that the endowment was for general instruction. If the endowment was not for the giving of religious instruction or for the purposes of the building, then the original words of the Clause came in, but if it was a mixed endowment, somebody ought to decide how much was to go to the managers. All the Amendment of his hon. friend asked was that the board of managers should have to prove that what they claimed was just, and that the amount to which they could not prove themselves entitled in the case of a mixed endowment should be handed over to the local education authority. As matters stood at present, the local education authority had to prove their claim; the Amendment suggested that the onus of proof should be on the other side, and that the managers and not the education authority should be compelled to prove their claim.

Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that not only was the Amendment limited by the first words of the Clause, but it was obvious that the greater part of the money which the Amendment suggested should be handed over to the education, authority would, in the ordinary course, be expended by the managers, under the supervision and control of the education authority. All that the Amendment desired was that that part of the endowment which was in express terms to be used for sectarian education should be left unreservedly in the hands of the managers for that purpose, and that the rest of the endowment, which was for the general purposes of education, should be under the supervision and control of the education authority. That was consistent with the scheme of the Bill as laid again and again before the House and the country by the Government, and, in his opinion, the Amendment was a perfectly rational and reasonable Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said the Secretary to the Board of Education in his answer had hardly appreciated the dominant idea of his hon. friend the Member for Mid-Glamorgan. His hon. friend in his Amendment was proceeding on a line which the Government had already suggested by the arrangement they had proposed.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said the answer of the Secretary to the Board of Education that this Amendment was against the spirit of the Clause was not any answer to the House. The whole complaint of the Opposition was that the endowments Clause was contrary to the meaning and spirit of the Bill. The very basis of this Bill was that there were to be two parties to a new arrangement; but the Government throughout the Committee stage had been steadily bringing in mean and niggling Amendments, every one of which was to get rid of the terms of the arrangements with regard to the denominational schools. The question to be considered was what was the fair way of dealing with the new condition of things which was going to be applied to old trust deeds. It was said that this proposal would override the trust deeds. He submitted that this was a case in which these old trust deeds should be overridden, otherwise the managers might seize all this money for denominational purposes, although it was intended for educational purposes. A man 200 years ago allocated money for the maintenance of a school. At the time there was no duty on the community to maintain a school. In many parishes no education at all was maintained, and men recognising the necessity and finding it unprovided for, left property, the income from which was to be spent on the maintenance of schools in those villages. But as the duty of providing education was now to be a national duty, did the Government contend that those trust deeds were to be maintained? Obviously, they could not be, as the Bill was to apply everywhere. The question then arose—how were those trust deeds, which must in the circumstances of the case be overridden, to be dealt with? In what way ought they to be set aside? The Government said: "Do not set them aside at all where they will benefit our existing denominational schools; let us seize every penny under these trust deeds for denominational purposes, although the trusts were created for educational purposes." On the other hand, his hon. and learned friend suggested that the trust deeds should be dealt with in the spirit of the Bill. Under the Bill the denominational managers were to control the denominational teaching in the schools, although they did not pay a penny of the cost, on the ground that they originally provided the building and were in future to carry out the repairs. But under the endowments Clause, wherever there was an income in the hands of trustees which could by any possibility be used for the maintenance and up-keep of the buildings, instead of the subscribers bearing the expense, the money of the trust deeds was to be used. That was contrary to the spirit of the Bill, and it was an evidence of the mean and niggling spirit of the supporters of the measure, which would make a deep impression on the people of the country by whom this question would have to be finally decided.

5.48. Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 227; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 546.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert

Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, RtHn.J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn.SirJ. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson

Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (CityofLond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hn.G.R C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirEW(BurySEdm'nds
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, SirWm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, RtHnSirHE. (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hon. SirFrederickG
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, HC(North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. SirC. EH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glagow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davis, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes.—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Corrie Grant.

*(6.0.) **The Chairman**: The Amendment of the hon. Member for Carnarvon seems to raise the same question again.

Mr. Lloyd-George said the question was not quite the same, and he thought he could make it perfectly clear that his Amendment raised quite a different question. He moved to omit the word "those" before the words "purposes of a public elementary school." He said that the object of this and consequential Amendments was to withdraw from the discretion of the trustees endowments left for the maintenance of the school as an institution, and not merely for the maintenance of the fabric. When they came to the purposes of education, these trusts divided themselves into two branches, one being to establish and found school buildings or the provision of a site, or money to build a school. He contended that the trustees would be entitled to say "This money is given for building and we are entitled to use it for repairing and extensions if we like." There were other cases where the money had been given for maintenance. In a case of that kind this Clause would not give discretion to the trustees. In one case he knew of a sum of money which was given for fit and deserving bachelors: another sum was for buying Welsh Bibles and for the preaching of a sermon on Whit Monday; and there was another sum set apart for the education of the children of the labouring classes. Where the money was given to educate the children of the parish, surely in a case of that kind it was clear that the money ought to be given to the local education authority. Take a case where the charity was established to maintain education in a parish, and a second case where it was intended to build schools. Now the Government stated that with regard to the first charity its object remained. They did not, however, take over the functions and the trustees had still to discharge them, but with regard to the second case the Government now proposed that the local education authority in the future was to step into the shoes of the trustees, do their work, take the responsibility, and the liability, financial and otherwise, was theirs, and if there was a fund for the purpose the local authority ought to be relieved to the amount of that sum. He wished to reverse the process established by the Government. The Government said that if it was given at all for educational purposes, whether for maintenance or for the fabric, in such a case absolute discretion should be given to the trustees unless the money was ear-marked for a specific branch. If the money was given for general purposes of maintenance, then he understood that the trustees used their discretion. That was not fair from the point of view of the Government. If money was given for maintenance and could be transferred to the up-keep of the fabric, that was a diversion of the charity from the original object of the trust. He was now simply advocating good sound Conservative principles. The Government seized this property and diverted it to another object. If this were done in regard to private property they would call it confiscation and robbery, but because it was the property of the poor and of the ratepayer they practically said that they could rob them to any extent. If the Government would say that an endowment left for "maintenance" would go to the local authority the Amendment fell to the ground. But they would not say so.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): It is for the Courts of law to say what would happen.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Bill must be passed in such a form that the Courts of law could understand it. Besides, these questions would be decided by the Board of Education. But if the noble Lord and his friends said that the purpose of an endowment could be altered to relieve a landowner of his subscriptions, how could he object if another Government some day altered the purpose of endowment for the benefit of the whole community?

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, to leave out the word 'those,' and insert the word 'the.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'those' stand part of the Clause."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he was not going to follow or even to attempt to imitate the vituperation which the hon. Member had indulged in—

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Whom did I vituperate? I was very civil.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the hon. Member spoke of robbery, confiscation, and such terms as those.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I was only quoting the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would confine his observations to a somewhat narrower sphere. The Government wished to leave the discretion to the managers where there was a discretion already. Maintenance, in the sense in which it was used, would correspond to benefit—the purposes of the school, the general objects of the school. He admitted that if it could be shown in any trust deed that money was given for the maintenance of a school in the narrower sense in which the word maintenance was used in the Bill, it would go direct to the education authority, but there was no ground for the charge that the Government were perverting the word "maintenance" in trust deeds to mean something different from what it really did mean. There was no wish to depart from the provisions of the trust deed, but if any question arose as to the proper interpretation of the trust deed, the persons who were responsible would be responsible before the Courts of law. If it was desired to ransack the conditions of trust deeds and to provide means, uniform in character, of dealing with them, and which should be applicable to all trusts and endowments now held for the purposes of education, that was not a subject which the Government proposed to introduce in the Bill. This might be a question for another Bill on another occasion, but at present the Government were content to take the trusts as they found them.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS agreed with the Bishop of London that there was no desire to start the working of the Bill by raising points for wholesale litigation. But they were anxious to find out what was intended by the Government, and for that reason an attempt was being made to make provisions clear which were at present obscure. If an endowment was intended for the support of the school as distinguished from the school-house, did the Government mean to allow the managers to utilise that endowment under the provisions of this Clause for the maintenance of the fabric and its repair? They were on sound ground when they asked this explanation. He thought when they raised these distinct questions they ought to receive explanations of what the Government meant. It was not satisfactory to be told that if difficulties arose it was for the Courts of law to clear them up.

MR. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) said he quite agreed with his hon. and learned friend that it was most expedient that the determination of questions such as this should not be left to the interpretation of the Courts of law. They had far too much experience of that procedure already, and the Committee ought to be warned by that experience not to repeat a mistake into which previous legislators had fallen. He took note of one statement of the Secretary to the Board of Education with satisfaction—that when a trust was so explanatory that it directed the money to be applied to the maintenance of the school, then it was clear that the local authority should be entitled to the benefit of the fund.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Maintenance in the sense in which maintenance is used in this Bill.

MR. ASQUITH said that the interruption was a good illustration of the use of ambiguous language in an Act of Parliament or elsewhere. Did that mean that where the pious founder who created the trust has stated his purpose, and the sole purpose, to which the trust was to be applied, there and there only it should go to the local authority? He thought without being very rash they might safely assert that there were very few trusts indeed in which the author of the trust had the prevision to anticipate that by some future legislative settlement only this purpose would be available. The principle laid down by the Amendment of his hon. friend was that where the trust was such that they might infer from the language that the proceeds were intended to be applied to the fund for the support and benefit of the school, the local authority should be regarded as the present beneficiaries of the trust and should be entitled to the proceeds. Where, on the other hand, it could be clearly collected from the language of the trust that it was intended to be limited to a purpose over which the managers had jurisdiction, another state of things would arise. What he and his hon. friends wanted was that the presumption should be in cases where general language was used, and from which they could infer that the education of the children in the parish was the real purpose of the foundation, that the local authority should be the persons entitled to the benefit of the fund.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said the Secretary of the Education Department ignored the actual condition of things. The hon. Baronet quoted from a trust deed in which the phrase "maintenance of the school," was used. Where that phrase was used before this Bill was introduced it had covered everything connected with the up-keep of the school. It had covered repairs, white-washing, painting the building, the provision of books for the children, payment of the salaries of the teachers, the provision of coals, and lighting where there was artificial light, and so on. Wherever the words "maintenance of the school" were used in a trust deed when this Bill came to be applied to them the phrase would be ambiguous. What did the hon. Baronet suggest? Not that, recognising this ambiguity, they should deal with it and make it clear, but that they should refer the subject to the Courts of law. It was a curious thing that the persons who were protesting against reference to the Courts of law in this matter were those who would have to deal with the cases if they went there. They knew how unsatisfactory it was to send to a law court for the interpretation of a document to which a special meaning was attached after that document came into existence, and that was what the Board of Education was suggesting now.

On the other hand, what he and his hon. friends wanted was that those who had to administer education should be able to administer it under perfectly clear and sensible conditions, and should not have their work hampered by a series of appeals to the law courts. Until the introduction of this Bill, "maintenance" had never meant the drawing of a distinction between the up-keep of the building and the carrying on of the school. The Bill now made this distinction. If the matter was now left unsettled, there would be appeals to the Courts, perhaps contrary decisions, and after all they would then have to come to the House of Commons and ask that the matter should be put right.

Mr. SOARES said that the hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech, treated of three classes of endowments, the first two of which might be used for the benefit of the denominational schools. In the third class where the money was to be devoted generally to maintaining the schools, the local authorities should have the control of it. Henceforth the local authority will have the duty laid upon it of maintaining these schools, and if they were to take that burden it was only fair that they should have the assets also. The denominational schools had gone into voluntary liquidation, and they were asked to take them over. There was no question of confiscation in regard to this matter. In every case the money belonging to the denomination was to go to the denomination, and it was only where the money had been given for education that it was to go to the local authority. The position of two classes of people had been altered by the Bill. He meant the rich and the poor. The subscribers would have the "intolerable strain" taken off them, but on the other hand the ratepayers would have a new burden imposed on them, and that would be very keenly felt in the rural districts. He supported the Amendment on the ground that it was infinitely better that small endowments should go to the relief of the pockets of the ratepayers rather than those of the wealthy subscribers to voluntary schools.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he had been fairly puzzled with this Clause, it was so difficult to understand: so much so that he was unable to support one of the Amendments, for it seemed to him to mean exactly the opposite of what the hon. Member who moved it intended it to mean. The usual words that were used in the older endowments were "for the support of the school," or "for the schooling or the education of so many poor children." He really did not think that the words of this Clause in the least suited these cases, which were the usual form of trust deeds. One reason why he supported the Amendment of his hon. friend was that his words were clear. If the words "for the purposes of a school" were used, the Clause would be rendered much clearer and more distinct than it was when originally introduced, and he was sure that unless the Clause were amended in the sense of the Amendment it would cause a great deal of litigation.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said that the hon. Baronet had drawn a distinction between "maintenance" as it was used in the Bill, and "maintenance" as it was used in trust deeds: and he had based on the distinction he had so drawn an argument why this money should not be given to the local education authority but should be retained in the hands of the managers. He had been making some detailed inquiry into the terms employed in trust deeds, and in many cases he found that they contained absolutely no reference to the school buildings, but related solely and simply to the education of children in the schools. If the hon. baronet would make inquiry, careful and detailed, he would find that very seldom indeed, even by implication, was there an assumption to the effect that "maintenance" related to these school buildings. In one parish, and he took these illustrations at random, the endowment was for the "education of poor children." In the next parish the endowment was for the gratuitous education of one or more children. In another parish the money was to be applied in the payment of scholarships of £1 each to deserving boys not less than twelve years of age. In all these cases there was no reference whatever to school buildings. The reply of the hon. Baronet had not covered that point in the slightest degree, and he trusted after this Debate that the Government would see there was a case to be met.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it was obvious that in the cases mentioned by the hon. Member, the money was to be expended by the local education authority on education, as was provided for by the Clause as it stood.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. Baronet had not answered a much more important case than of a fund for the support of a school in existence.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the funds would go for repairs.

(6.42.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 547.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHn.Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt. Hon.SirJohn E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Dougla)
Faber, George Denison (Yorks
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir RobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary(St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirE W(BurySEdm'nds
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset,E.
Hope,J.F(Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,RtHon.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
PeaseHerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.

Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyn'side
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randall
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Samuel Evans.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said the effect of the Amendment he proposed to move would be that the proviso would apply to all trusts and would not be limited. It would apply to all trusts as to which the provision had to be made, and not be limited to the purposes of the public elementary schools. He ventured to think this was an Amendment that the Government would accept. It had nothing to do with matters which they had debated earlier in the afternoon. It would, he ventured to suggest, help the co-ordination of education. The Government had always said that one of the objects of the Bill was to produce unity, and if they accepted that principle of co-ordination he could not see why they should attempt to limit this Clause to elementary education. He submitted in that case it should be extended to all classes of education.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, to leave out the words 'of a public elementary school.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the hon. Member proposed an entire recasting of the purposes of the Clause by bringing within its scope all manner of educational endowments, and he could hardly be serious in thinking that the Government would accept it. The object of the Government in introducing the Clause was to deal with elementary schools only which were not provided by the education authority, and they could not possibly extend its scope to secondary schools.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) supported the Amendment. He instanced a village with which he was acquainted which was possessed of a board school which had an average attendance of 226 children, by the side of which was a little school under an endowment which had twelve children. The only thing this little school did was to withdraw that number of children from the far better education which they would receive at the board school.

(7.3.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 114. (Division List No. 548.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil

Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer

Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G (Oxf'rd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edward M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C, E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Corrie Grant and
Mr. Allen.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE moved an Amendment providing that the decision of the Board of Education should not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days public notice had been given to the local education authority and the minor local authority, had been held. He pointed out that the Charity Commissioners, when they examined into local charities, always had a public inquiry of which notice was given. In case of a dispute between the local managers of a school and the local education authority, how were the Board of Education to get at the facts? Were they to decide the matter on a written presentment of the case by the managers, or were they to send a representative to investigate the whole of the circumstances? Unless the latter course were adopted, a very novel principle would be introduced into dealings with property, trust funds, and endowments. In most cases a scheme was already in operation, but the practical result of this Cause would be that new schemes would have to be made. The Board of Education would have to decide whether a certain charity was for maintenance, or for the fabric, or for religious purposes. That was a judicial function. Then they would have to decide whether it was a fund partly for maintenance and partly for repairs, and, if so, how to divide it. Such questions required the most careful local investigation. An important point would be the manner in which the money had been used in the past, and it was a question of evidence. Did the Board intend to get that evidence by affidavits? That was the last way in the world to get at the truth. The only satisfactory way was to send a Commissioner down to investigate all the circumstances of the case. Hitherto the Board of Education had been purely an administrative body, but they were now taking upon themselves the functions of a judicial tribunal. That being so they ought surely to proceed on judicial principles. The Amendment proposed nothing that could contravene the principle of the Clause, whatever that principle might be, and therefore, as it was only fair that the Parish Council and the parish should have an opportunity of presenting their case, he hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'but the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to the local education authority and to the minor local authority, shall have been first held by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said many cases might arise under the Clause in which it would be convenient and desirable to hold a local inquiry, but many other cases might arise in which the whole question would be the interpretation of a document which might be interpreted as well at Whitehall as in the locality itself. The local authority would not be wholly unrepresented in the matter from the very outset, because both the local education authority and the minor local authority had representatives on the board of managers, and would, therefore, be aware of what was passing not only from the managers' point of view but also from the point of view of the locality. It seemed to him harsh and unnecessary that the local authority should be saddled in every case of a dispute with the delay and the cost of a public inquiry when a careful study of documents might be all that was needed. He had no doubt the Board of Education would hold an inquiry whenever it was necessary.

Mr. BRYCE was sorry the Government had not given a more favourable answer, because they had admitted that in many cases a local inquiry would be necessary. Frequently such an inquiry would be the only way by which both the local authority and the people on the spot would be made to feel that the case had been properly presented. Why not assent to allowing a local inquiry wherever the local education authority asked for it? They could rely that such inquiries would not be needlessly asked for, as the local authority would have to bear the expense. It was necessary that the Government should give some better guarantee than was contained in the Clause that the local opinion would be properly ascertained.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS thought the suggestion of his right hon. friend an eminently reasonable one, though possibly it did not go quite far enough. The Parish Council also ought to have the right to call for a public inquiry, and he suggested that the Government should provide for a public inquiry being held whenever the education authority or the minor local authority desired it. He expressed his astonishment at hearing the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education declare that in most cases all that would be necessary was the construction or the interpretation of a written document. That was the duty of a Court of law, not of the Board of Education.

It being half-past seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'but the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to the local education authority and to the minor local authority, shall have been first held by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

(9.0.) Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said this was the first time that the Education Department had been set up as a legal tribunal, and in his judgment the Board of Education would not, in all cases, be competent to interpret the documents so as to give satisfaction to all who were interested in the controversy. There was a time, not far distant, when there was an eminent legal personage at the head of the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had been one of the legal advisers of the Crown, and would be admitted to be a competent authority to discuss the legal interpretation of certain deeds. At the present moment they had at the Board the hon. Baronet, who, perhaps, was not so qualified as his predecessors, but who nevertheless would show very great competency to deal with these matters. But they had not always such able Gentlemen representing the Board of Education in the House of Commons. They might, indeed, have a layman who was as qualified to give a proper legal interpretation of a document. They ought to discuss this question of inquiry on general principles. Whenever they asked the Board of Education to determine between two bodies how an endowment should be divided they ought to give public notice, and have a public inquiry so that the particular locality affected should have an opportunity of defending its own interests. Already, in three places in that Bill provisions had been inserted for public notice being given in certain events and for public inquiry to be held. The first was in Clause 9, dealing with the provision of new schools. The next was in Clause 11, describing how duties under the Elementary Education Acts were to be enforced by the Education Department, and that provided in terms, that if the local education authority did not fulfil its duties the Board of Education might, after holding a public inquiry, issue such orders as it thought necessary. The only other Clause under which a public inquiry was to be held was Clause 12, and under that they had the provision that the Board of Education before approving any scheme should take measures for the purpose of giving publicity to the provisions of the proposed scheme, and might, if it thought fit, hold a public inquiry. Under Clause 9 public notice was to be given in order to invest the ratepayers with the right of appeal to the Education Department, but here it was simply asked that notice should be given to the local authority. As to the inquiry to be allowed under Clauses 11 and 12, surely if that were necessary one was equally desirable under the provisions of the new Clause under discussion, a Clause which provided for the division of the income from an endowment, and the award of one portion to the managers and another to the local education authority. His experience was that the parish in which the endowment was situated and for which it had been bequeathed was intensely interested in the question of its administration. But under the proposal of the Government the parish was entirely ignored—the only parties taken cognisance of were the managers of the voluntary schools and the local education authority, Surely it was not unreasonable to ask that the people chiefly and mainly interested should have an opportunity of laying their views before the Board of Education, and surely if a public inquiry were necessary before a scheme was approved, it was equally necessary before the division was made. The scheme might be altered or revoked by the express terms of the Bill, but once the endowment was divided the decision was final. Under the circumstances he submitted that the Amendment of his hon. friend was perfectly sound from the point of view of the necessity of holding a public inquiry, and public notice ought to be given in order that the views of those who were interested should be properly placed before the Board of Education. He hoped that the Government would accept the Amendment and that it would be extended so as to provide for public notice as well as public inquiry, so as to afford an opportunity either to the Parish Council or the Rural District Council to lay their views—without unnecessary expense—before the Board of Education prior to its making a division of the endowment.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said the Amendment was not one involving a sectarian question, but it dealt with the question of the best way of dividing the endowment. Looking at it from a practical point of view, he regarded the Amendment not only as unnecessary, but as absolutely mischievous. There was a vast number of these endowments, although the aggregate incomes did not exceed £160,000 annually, and in a great many cases there would have to be a revision. He was very glad that it was the Board of Education, and not the Charity Commissioners, that was to undertake this work. The labour would be immense and a great deal of local friction would be raised, and if in addition a local inquiry were compulsory in every case there would be unending work, an enormous staff would be required, and many years would elapse before the inquiries were settled. It was perfectly unnecessary, because, by the general law affecting charitable trusts, the Charity Commissioners were empowered to order an inquiry whenever they liked into the administration of a trust. These powers had been transferred by an Order in Council from the Charity Commissioners to the Board of Education, and consequently in every single case they could order an inquiry if they thought there was any reason for so doing. Was not that quite sufficient to meet the case put by the hon. Member opposite? The inquiries in most cases were perfectly unnecessary, because all that could be necessary would be to construe documents. In the majority of the cases all the necessary information was ready to hand, and it was only necessary to apply common sense to the task. It would be perfectly ridiculous to go to the expense of sending a special commission to hold an inquiry on the spot. Under the Local Government Act of 1894, the Charity Commissioners were made the arbiters of most difficult questions—such as what was or was not an ecclesiastical charity. That raised the religious difficulty in hundreds of parishes, but the Charity Commissioners dealt with all the cases as they came before them. They generally came to a decision on documents which were in their office, but where the trusts were doubtful they ordered an inquiry. If those powers sufficed in that case, surely they would be equally sufficient for the Board of Education in this instance. He wished to see this Clause worked in a practical spirit, and he therefore opposed the Amendment because he believed it would clog the wheels of the Department, which had to administer a most difficult piece of machinery.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he wished to explain that it was not the inquiry, but its proposed compulsory character, that he objected to. If the inquiry were made dependent on the demand of the local education authority he should be prepared to accept that and to move an Amendment to carry it out.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he should be quite prepared to accept an Amendment in the form that an inquiry should be granted if requested or demanded by the local education authority.

MR. BRYCE was very glad the hon. Baronet had accepted the Amendment. He thought the Secretary to the Board of Education would find that this proposal would give satisfaction to all concerned.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL asked at whose cost the inquiry was to be held.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The local education authority.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said that, if the Government put in the words suggested, they should also allow an inquiry on the demand of trustees. He might mention the case of the Harpar Trust at Bedford. Under a scheme made in 1873, certain sums were set aside for the purposes of a public elementary school and certain schools were carried on by the Governors of the Trust, who, of course, received education grants in the usual way. The question was, what would happen to their endowments? Their schools would come under the provisions of the Bill, and if any question should arise as to a division of the two-elevenths of the Trust income, surely the trustees should have a right to demand an inquiry.

Mr. Griffith Boscawen.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: If a public inquiry is held, the trustees will necessarily be parties to the inquiry.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he should have no objection to include trustees, though he would point out that it would not be fair that trustees should be allowed to call for inquiries of this sort when the expense fell on the local authority. That body was not likely to incur heavy expense by demanding wholesale unnecessary inquiries.

MR. BOUSFIELD: I shall be content if my hon. friend will promise to consider this point.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the trustees would certainly have full notice of any inquiry which was to take place under the Clause, and they would also have complete access to the Board of Education. In these circumstances, he thought the interests of trustees would be adequately protected. He thought that the costs of the inquiry should be borne by the authority demanding it, and that should be the only condition on which a public inquiry would be held.

MR. JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) complained that as the Amendment did not appear on the Paper it was very difficult to understand what they were discussing. He gathered that the Government was willing to agree that the local authority should have power to demand a public inquiry, and he thought the proposal of the Secretary to the Board of Education a very unsatisfactory solution of a difficult problem. It had been pointed out in the lucid and closely-reasoned speech of the hon. Member for Glamorgan that there was first the objection that the Secretary to the Board of Education might not be well fitted, either by education or practice, for construing legal documents. But it seemed to be forgotten that he would always have at his service the highest legal acumen of the country, and would be able to consult not only the legal advisers of the Department but also the Law Officers of the Crown. Again, it should be remembered that a considerable number of deeds would be in the same form, and one decision would govern many cases. If they left it to the discretion of the local education authority they would be continually liable to have pressure brought to bear upon them from without. Although there might really be no doubt of the result the local authority might consider it a duty to ask for an inquiry. It was absolutely unnecessary to put this temptation in the way of a local authority. It would be a temptation difficult to resist, and very often these matters would be brought forward by representatives keenly interested at the time, but wholly unable to distinguish between the construction of a legal document and the sympathy men in public life had for the wishes of those by whose votes they are supported. These matters could be dealt with readily enough by a gentleman of legal training, and if they were left to the discretion of the Board of Education there would be reasonable prospect of finality. If they were left to the discretion of a number of newly-constituted authorities, new brooms anxious to sweep clean and justify their existence, he saw no end to the prospect of inquiries of this kind throughout the country. On the mere ground of burdening the country with inquiries he hoped the Government would pause before they accepted any such suggestion as that which had been made. Where the public interest demanded an inquiry he had not the slightest doubt that one would be ordered without hesitation, and upon that ground he hoped the Government would think twice before they rashly committed themselves to an Amendment which was not on the Paper, and which might introduce far greater confusion and difficulty than was contemplated at the present moment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood that the words he proposed had been accepted by the Government. The only other suggestion was that he thought notice should also be given to the trustees of any inquiry, and he would suggest that words to this end should be inserted.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON suggested the following form of words:—

"But if a local inquiry be demanded by the local education authority the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to the trustees, the local education authority and the minor authority, shall have been held by the Board of Education."

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he wished to ask a question in regard to the cost of these inquiries. He had heard no reference to costs in this discussion. He thought it ought to be made perfectly clear that the local authority demanding the inquiry should pay the costs. He hoped his hon. friend, if he pressed this Amendment, would insert words providing for the payment of the costs by the local authority, because some of the charities which would be affected were very limited in their means.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'education,' to insert the words 'but if a local inquiry is demanded by the local education authority the decision of the Board of Education shall not be given until after a local inquiry, of which ten days' previous notice shall be given to the local education authority and to the minor local authority and to the trustees, shall have been first held by the Board of Education.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE pointed out that by this Amendment they would be in the same position in regard to these inquiries as any other Departmental inquiry by the Board of Trade or the Local Government Board. If they stuck in the word "costs" it had an ominous sound for the lawyers, but if they left it as it was left in the case of any other Departmental inquiries it simply meant that an inspector would be sent down and the costs would only amount to his travelling expenses.

MR. BOUSFIELD said he should like some one who had had Departmental experience to state his views upon this question. He urged that a proviso should be inserted in the Bill imposing the cost of the inquiry on the local authorities demanding it, or they might leave the matter in the hands of the Board of Education. He did not desire to press the matter now, but he should like the Government to give the question further consideration.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) thought that they ought to have this point properly settled before the words suggested were inserted in the Bill. The whole argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite had been that there would be a check upon the demand for inquiries made by the local authority because they would have to pay the costs. When the Government conceded that point it was suddenly discovered that there was no provision made for making the local authority pay the costs. He moved to add the words "at the cost of the local authority."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the last word 'education,' to insert the words 'at the cost of the local education authority.'"—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Question proposed. "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. WHITLEY said it would be best to put the Amendment, on which they were all agreed.

SIR JOHN GORST: Oh, no! we are not at all agreed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought there ought to be some power in regard to costs vested in the Board of Education similar to that vested in Government Departments in regard to inquiries. He preferred the word "expenses" to "costs."

SIR JOHN GORST said the words he proposed were "at the cost of the local education authority." He did not mind the word "expenses."

MR. BRYCE pointed out that in another part of the Bill where inquiries were provided for no reference was made to costs all. Speaking from recollection, he did not think that in the various Statutes which directed or empowered inquiries anything was said about the cost and the question was generally left to the discretion of the Department concerned.

SIR JOHN GORST said the reason he moved his Amendment was that it was urged by hon. Gentlemen opposite that there was no danger in giving this power of forcing an inquiry provided that it was restrained by the knowledge that if a local authority did force an inquiry they would have to pay the costs. Now when he proposed an Amendment carrying out what every hon. Member opposite had urged they objected to the insertion of these words. No doubt the words of the Amendment which had been accepted would be revised by the Attorney General, and they could be altered on Report.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE quoted from the Local Government Act, showing that the question of costs in regard to these inquiries was a purely discretionary order. He did not think it was fair that the cost should be imposed upon the local education authority in all cases, because an inquiry would be an expensive matter for them in any event. He thought they ought to consent to a discretionary order to impose costs against any of the parties in the usual form. The words proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Cambridge University were not discretionary but mandatory, and under his Amendment the Board of Education would be compelled to impose the costs upon the local education authority. He thought the Board of Education should have the same power in this matter as any other Government Department.

SIR JOHN GORST said that as the First Lord of the Treasury had just returned to the Treasury Bench he would briefly repeat the grounds for proposing his Amendment. The Government proposed that the Board of Education might order a public inquiry into the question of the separation of the trust in order that they might be able to devote a part to maintenance and to future repairs. A proposal was made by hon. Members opposite that in case the local education authority so wished, it ought to be permitted to demand an inquiry, and the argument used by hon. Members opposite was that as the local authority would be willing to pay the costs there would be a perfect safeguard that no unnecessary inquiries would be demanded. When that was agreed to by his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education, who suggested an Amendment to carry out that view, he proposed to add a few words to ensure that where the local education authority forced the Board of Education to institute an inquiry it should pay the costs, and such inquiries should be held at the expense of the local education authority demanding the inquiry. Then an objection to this was raised by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that what they were most concerned about was that under no circumstances should the authority bear the cost. He thought they might very well leave the question to the discretion of the Board of Education, because the Amendment suggested by his right hon. friend would create a good deal of unnecessary machinery.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was surprised at the zeal displayed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University for putting the costs on the local education authority.

SIR JOHN GORST replied that, as the hon. Member opposite had not been present during the whole of this discussion, he was afraid he did not know what had happened. The whole argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite had been that there was no danger in allowing the local education authority to force an unnecessary inquiry because it would be restrained by reason of having to pay the costs.

DR. MACNAMARA reminded the right hon. Gentleman that he had been present during the whole of the discussion. If no reference was made in Clause 12 to expenses, why should they introduce that matter here? He agreed with the suggestion of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education, but if they introduced the words proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, or any other phrase of that kind, they would mulct the local authority in a very large sum of money.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS suggested to the Government that the proper way of dealing with the matter was to leave the Clause without any reference to the costs at all, and, if on consideration before the Report stage, they thought that any provision should be made in regard to costs, they should make it a general provision, such as was proposed by his hon. friend. It should be a provision similar to that contained in the Public Health Act. What was proposed here was to insert a reference to costs in respect of one sort of public inquiry, whereas there were two other sorts of public inquiries provided for in the Bill and in respect of which there was no reference to costs at all. There ought to be a general provision about costs, which would apply to all forms of public inquiry which might be held under the powers conferred by the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he was in the House when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen made the suggestion that if the local education authority asked for an inquiry they should have it, and that they should bear the costs. He believed that in nine cases out of ten where questions arose no local inquiry would be necessary at all. If the local education authority desired an inquiry, they ought to say that they were ready to bear the costs, and that would afford a sort of test whether there was any substantial reason to suppose that the people of the locality were of opinion that an inquiry should be held.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said he could not think of any easier way of choking off a real grievance than by telling the local education authority that they might be liable for some indefinite amount for costs. He knew a case where a parish was anxious to have an inquiry into the administration of a certain charity, and, on being asked to hold an inquiry, the Board of Education assented on condition that security was given for the costs. When the Board was asked what the costs were likely to be, no satisfactory answer could be obtained. For that reason he thought it would be most impolitic to impose on the locality the burden of paying the costs in all cases. He should be quite willing to accede to the proposal that the awarding of costs should be in the discretion of the Department.

Mr. BRYCE said that he did not withdraw from anything he had formerly said on this matter. He wished to call attention to the fact that if the Committee passed any such provision here, doubt would be cast on the question of costs under Clause 11, which gave power to the Board of Education to hold an inquiry where the local education authority failed to perform their duty. He should have thought that the simplest course for settling this matter would have been to accept the suggestion of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the suggestion made from this side of the House was a perfectly practical one, and it was in accordance with the precedents in regard to inquiries ordered by the Local Government Board and the Board of Trade. These Departments had discretion to impose costs in connection with local inquiries, and what was wanted was that similar discretion should be given to the Board of Education.

(10.3) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 549.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James

Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry

Sir R. Finlay.

Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hope,JF.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hn.J.Scott(Hants.)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hn. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford, East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel WilliamGeorge
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William(Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grey, Rt. Hon.Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon.Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William(Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Taylor, TheodoreC. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Samuel Evans.

Word, as amended, inserted.

MR. M'KENNA said that in drafting the Amendment he now moved, he had followed the precedent set by the Government in Clause 10 of the Bill, where it was laid down that the Board of Education should have regard to certain main principles. He proposed now that the Board of Education, in deciding any difference, should be guided by the financial interests of the two bodies in a particular school. He could not conceive a more equitable principle than that to guide the Board of Education in cases where no guidance was given them by the trust as to the disposition of the endowment. Surely it would be more reasonable that the Board of Education should determine the amount or cost which the local authority had to bear relating to the school, and, on the other hand, the amount that fell on the managers for keeping the buildings in repair. In that way substantial justice would be done as between the two parties. It must be remembered that whatever was given to the education authority was really not diverted from the purposes of the trust, for it would come back again; but whatever was given to the managers would really be lost for the general purposes of the endowment, and would only go in the relief of subscribers to the voluntary schools. He submitted that, as the Board of Education must have some guiding principle in determining the proportion that was to go to each of the parties to the dispute, the only right line on which that proportion should be determined was the proportion of cost the two parties would have to bear in the maintenance of the school.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'in determining any difference under this section, the Board of Education shall have regard to the proportion in which the whole cost of the school is met out of funds provided by the local education authority and the foundation managers respectively.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he thought that the line which the hon. Member wished to give to the inquiry to be conducted by the Board of Education was hardly relevant to the subject of the Clause and of the inquiry which was to be directed by the Board of Education. Inquiry as to what was the origin of the trust and the original intention of the donor would be necessary, though sometimes difficult, but an inquiry into the respective needs of the claimants was irrelevant. What the hon. Member proposed to put before the Board of Education would be very much as if a judge were instructed to inquire which of two litigants wanted the money most. The inquiry should be which of the parties was entitled to the money, and not which of the two was the hungrier for the endowment. The Government could not accept the Amendment.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said if the sole inquiry was as to which of the two parties was the hungrier, he thought that there could be no doubt at all that the Church would be found to be the hungrier. Wherever booty was to be obtained, the Church party was after it: they were the disciples of the loaves and the fishes, and of the person who kept the purse. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] These observations, however, were not very relevant to the Amendment, but they had been called forth by the remarks of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The question before the Committee was whether or not there should be any guiding principle at all to the Board of Education. The hon. Baronet said that that was very like going before a judge and asking him to decide which of the party would like to have the booty; but wherever a question in regard to money arose before a judge, what he had to direct his mind to was, who, according to the law, was entitled to the money? But there was no material in the trust deed to guide the Board of Education, and the very reason why the Amendment was necessary was, that in the absence of any provision in the trust deed, there ought to be some basis by which the Board, in their judgment, determined that one of the Party should get a tenth and the other nine-tenths, and on what ground. He did not know whether his hon. friend's method was the best one, but it seemed equitable.

Mr. BOUSFIELD said that the hon. Gentleman had declared that he was in favour of some principle—he did not care what it was.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he accepted the principle in the Amendment if the hon. Gentleman could not propose a better.

Mr. BOUSFIELD said they might as well suppose that the Board of Education would decide a dispute by a toss-up. It should be remembered that the circumstances of endowments and localities were infinitely various. He knew of various cases in which such an Amendment would operate with great injustice.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said that after all some principle would be better than no principle at all. It had been said that the Board of Education should have a free hand, but there was an exact precedent for this Amendment in an Amendment introduced by the Prime Minister in regard to the election of managers. The right hon. Gentleman's Amendment set forth: "In making an Order under this Section with regard to any school, the Board of Education should have regard to the principles on which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past." The Board of Education was to have regard to particular circumstances, and that was all that was asked in his hon. friend's Amendment. He submitted that the Board of Education was not to be allowed a free hand. He must say that under the last Vice-President of the Committee of Council he had no confidence in it at all. It might not be much to give the Board of Education a guiding principle, or guiding hand, but, at any rate, it would embarrass them to depart from it.

(10.33.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 93; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 550.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, L. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil Williams
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Ellis Griffith.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph, Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. H. A. G. (City of Lond
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.

Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H (Asht'n-und-Lyne
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley,Rt. Hon.C. B.Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said he would not move the Amendment standing in his name, in order to afford an opportunity for the discussion of the important Amendment in the name of the right hon. Gentleman, the Member for East Somerset.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that his Amendment dealt with a practical point in the Clause. Its object was to provide a proper way of dealing with those endowments which were too large to be devoted to the rates in the rough-and-ready manner proposed by the Clause. Those acquainted with the different endowments would agree that there were deeds of a varied and complex character which could not well be dealt with in such a very summary fashion as was proposed in sub-Section 2. In some cases those endowments were of a very considerable size. Among the list of such endowments which he had there was one in Hampshire of the value of £183 a year. He had examined the accounts of the school and he found that the amount spent on repairs last year was £28, more than £100 on salaries, and £33 on furnishing. The latter items would in future fall on the local authority. It was obvious that there must be a large proportion of the endowment which could not be dealt with by the managers. In that school there were only 42 children, though there was accommodation for 70. Supposing a repair fund of £20 or £30 a year was set aside, there would be a sum of £150 a year to be dealt with under sub-Section 2. In this parish a threepenny rate produced only £20 a year, and therefore £150 would be equivalent to something approaching a two shilling rate. The effect of sub-Section 2 would be to devote to the rates a larger amount than the new burden of the rates was likely to amount to, and they would be giving a considerable benefit to the ratepayers after discharging all the new liabilities which fell upon them under the Bill. Some people imagined that a charity for the relief of the poor ought to go to the ratepayers, but that he believed to be a fallacy. The poor of a parish might be ratepayers, but as a rule they were not; and in most cases the poor were much more numerous than the ratepayers. A provision like this, which said that educational endowments should be devoted to the aid of the rates, was neither consistent with equity nor with the principles on which charities had been administered for many years in this country. The County Council would have no statutory power to apply to the Board of Education for a new scheme unless words like his were inserted. The object of the words was to enable the County Council in places such as he had indicated to apply to the Board of Education to confirm a scheme under which the money might go not entirely in aid of rates, but the surplus might be devoted to those various educational purposes which might benefit the inhabitants of the parish. None of them wished to take the money away from the parish, but they all wished to see that the money was not wasted, and not devoted to a class which the founder did not intend to benefit. It could not be right to give a bonus to the ratepayers out of money intended for educational endowments. To the objection that the trustees might themselves apply, he replied that the trustees might have no interest to apply. Their interest might be adverse, they might be the largest ratepayers in the parish, and trustees were but human. The local authority, on the other hand, would have the interest and the duty to apply, and they were the body that ought to have the right of going to an impartial authority like the Board of Education and asking for a scheme. The Board of Education would have to consult the Parish Council under the Local Government Act; and, therefore, the voice of the parish would be heard; the voice of the local education authority would be heard; and the matter would be decided by the Board of Education.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 14, at end, to insert the words 'to the parish or parishes served by the school, and shall, unless otherwise applied in pursuance of a scheme made by the Board of Education on the application of the County Council, be applied.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the object of the right hon. Gentleman was one with which the Government and the House would entirely sympathise, but he did not think this Amendment carried the object into effect. The effect of the Amendment would be to seize on a portion of the endowment on its way from the trustees to the local education authority and the overseers; and to turn it to some purpose such as his right hon. friend had described. He agreed that provision should be made whereby persons interested, namely the parishioners, in the matter should be consulted, but anyhow the objection which the Government felt to the Amendment was that it dealt with only a portion of the endowments and not with the endowments as a whole. It was possible where an endowment was over £100 for the Board of Education to take the initiative, and deal with it by a scheme; and in the case of an endowment under £100, the governors or trustees could take the matter up; but to take only a portion of the endowment, and deal with it by means of a scheme which seemed to him to be a piecemeal method of dealing with a large subject, was not only not satisfactory but would tend to frustrate any subsequent scheme that might be put forward for dealing with endowments as a whole. For those reasons the Government could not accept the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said he profoundly regretted the pronouncement just made on behalf of the Government. Last night they had pointed out—and it was not seriously contested by hon. Members opposite—that the proposal to apply these educational charities to relieve the subscribers or the ratepayers was to do violence to the intention of the founders, and to sanction a breach of trust on the part of the House of Commons. To-night he was more than ever grieved that the hon. Gentleman representing the Government proposed to prevent this money, which might do such inestimable good to the poorest classes in the rural districts, being applied to help elementary children to receive the tincture of secondary education, and to take the money and apply it to the relief of well-to-do people. Nothing could be more regrettable in the whole course of the Bill. It marked the abandonment of an admirable opportunity of permanently helping the people. In order to put on record the serious view which the Opposition took of this matter, he would move an Amendment on behalf of his hon. friend, the Member for Poplar to strengthen the Amendment by inserting words to make it general in its application. He had no time to do more.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'unless otherwise' and insert the word 'be.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought the Committee was entitled, if only out of mere courtesy, to an expression of opinion from the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill regarding the Amendment of his right hon. friend. There was plenty of time to enable the hon. Gentleman to say whether he accepted it or not. As the hon. Gentleman would not reply, he would support the Amendment of his right hon. friend; and give a few reasons for doing so.

It being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded forthwith to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair and on the New Clauses proposed by the Government.

(11.1) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 551.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W, (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W, (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (Northm'b. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Henry Hobhouse and Mr. Bond.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty

Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(11.13) Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 552.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cremer, William Randal
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaugham-(Cardigan
Denny, Colonel
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Long, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.,
Whiteley, George (York, W.R ;
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Henry Hobhouse and
Mr. Bond.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
AllhusenAugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beresford, LordCharlesWilliam
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-HartlandSirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (CityofLond
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, SirEW(B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James HenryCecil
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohn H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, MajJ. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, HC(North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir WillamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(11.23) Question put "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 95. (Division List. No. 553.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour,KennethR.(Christch.)
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDix'n
Dorington,Rt.Hon.SirJohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,RtHon.SirWilliamHart

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William

Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,HnA.G.H(City of Lond.
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood

Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Lambton,Hon.Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray,Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry

Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon.M.W(Stalybridge
Ritchie,RtHon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Shaw-Stewart,M.H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward

Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby, de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George, (York W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

New Clause (local authority's managers)—(*Sir William Anson*)—added.

New Clause (grouping of schools under one management)—(*Sir William Anson*)—added.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Tomorrow

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 19th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

BURGH POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Caithness, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DOGS REGULATION BILL.

Petition from Caithness, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Greenfield; and Manchester; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Caithness, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Redhill, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (SANITARY MEASURES).

Copy presented, of Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1900-1901, Vol. XXXIV. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Grants for School Teachers' Houses, 1843-1881 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copies presented, of Minute sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the following counties:—

County of Carmarthen (First Minute), dated 21st October, 1902;

County of Salop (Fifth Minute), dated 21st October, 1902;

County of Glamorgan (Twelfth Minute), dated 15th October, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.

Copies presented, of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Northampton, Cornwall, Monmouth, and Berks) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Bill—Clause 2—Evening Continuation Schools.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether there is any provision in the Education Bill, or elsewhere, to enable a local education authority to teach elementary subjects, paid for out of funds set apart for higher education, in evening continuation schools, without contravening the meaning of Clause 2 of the Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) There is no such express provision. Whether any provision is in fact necessary, having regard to the words of Clause 2, is at present under consideration.

British Postal Orders from Turkey.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that 20s. postal orders cannot be purchased at the British post-offices at Constantinople, Salonica, and Smyrna; and, seeing that the French post-offices in Turkey charge the same commission on money orders there for France as is charged in France itself, he will, with a view to encourage British trade, give similar opportunities.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that postal orders for 20s. cannot be purchased at the British post-offices at Constantinople, Salonica, and Smyrna. The rates of commission charged at those offices for the issue of money orders are the same as are charged in this country for money orders payable at places abroad, and it is not proposed to interfere with them. According to the latest information in my possession the rates of commission charged on money orders issued at French post-offices in foreign countries for sums of £1 and over are higher than the French inland rates.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits—Rates of Interest.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that, in the case of accounts in the Post Office Savings Bank, fractions of £1 do not receive interest, and that the £ must have been on deposit a clear calendar month to secure interest, will he state the amount actually credited by way of interest in the books of the Department to the 805,436 accounts which are stated to have shown balances over £50 during the year 1899, and will he quote the total amount credited by way of interest during that year to the whole of the 8,046,680 accounts open.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The total amount of interest credited to all depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank for the year 1899 was £3,023,821. No figures are at present available to show how much of this sum was credited to accounts having balances over £50, and to obtain the desired information would involve an amount of labour and expense which I should not be justified in incurring.

Telegraph Learners—Starting Pay.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Postmaster General whether he will explain why the starting pay of telegraph learners has been raised in some of the largest offices in England, and whether he is prepared to extend the concession to the remainder of the offices throughout the country.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) As stated in the House on the 30th June last, a change has been temporarily made at some of the largest offices under exceptional circumstances, and it is not proposed to extend the change elsewhere.

Scottish Harbour Grants.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the fact that the Committee appointed in 1899 have received ten applications for grants in aid of harbours in Scotland, will he state the names of the places for which grants were refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The names of the places in Scotland for which grants were refused are (1) Auchmithie (Forfar); (2) Boddam (Aberdeen); (3) Broadbay (Ross and Cromarty); (4) Buckpool (Banff); (5) Dunbeath (Caithness); (6) North Knapdale (Argyle); (7) Portmahomack (Ross and Cromarty); (8) Valtos (Ross and Cromarty.)

Poultry Breeding in Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate whether he has any official reports showing the results of the efforts of the Congested Districts Board in the Island of Lewis to improve the breed of poultry; and will he state how many sittings of eggs have been sent to the Island of Lewis this year.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) It is very difficult for the Congested Districts Board to get replies to their inquiries from the recipients of eggs, but the general effect of those received is favourable. One hundred and forty-two fowls and forty sittings of eggs were applied for and sent to Lewis in the earlier half of 1902.

Port Ness (Lewis) Harbour.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the name of the engineer who has been deputed to report on the condition of the harbour at Port Ness, Island of Lewis; and will he state when this gentleman proposes to visit the harbour.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham A. Murray.*) Mr. William Shield. The actual date of his visit has not yet been definitely settled, but will probably be before the end of the year.

Inland Revenue (Ireland)—Game Licences.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any precautions are taken by the Inland Revenue Department to ensure that those who shoot game in Ireland are provided with a game certificate; whether the attention of the Department has been directed to evasions of the law in King's County; and whether any steps have been taken in relation thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes-Fisher.*) The officers of Inland Revenue in Ireland, with the co-operation of the Royal Irish Constabulary, take every precaution against evasions of the Game Licence Laws. The attention of the Board of Inland Revenue has not been specially drawn to evasions of these laws in King's County.

Civil Service Abstractors.

MR SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that in the Treasury, Colonial Office, Customs, Scotch Office, and Seamen's Registry, &c., Office certain assistant clerks (abstractor class) are in receipt of personal allowances or gratuities of £20 and £30 per annum, he will consider the advisability of extending this privilege to abstractors of meritorious service in other offices on the recommendation of the head of a Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes-Fisher.*) The Treasury is always ready to consider a recommendation from the head of a Department for an improvement in the position of an abstractor who is employed on work of a class higher than could otherwise be fairly required of him.

Poor Law—Proposed Central Superannuation Fund.

MR. FREEMAN THOMAS (Hastings): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been directed to resolutions recently passed by various poor law unions and conferences in favour of a central superannuation fund, and if in any Amendment of the Superannuation Act it will be made compulsory for poor law officers to retire at sixty-five: and whether, seeing that there are clerks connected with some unions who are nearly eighty years of age, the Local Government Board will suggest to the local board of guardians the need for paying greater attention to the retiring section of the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) My attention has been called to resolutions passed on the subject of a central superannuation fund. As to the second point, I am not aware that there is any proposal to amend the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act in the direction referred to. As regards the concluding part of the Question, it is competent to a board of guardians to require any officer who has attained the age of sixty-five to retire if they consider that this would be expedient in the interests of the public service. It does not at present seem to me necessary to communicate generally with boards of guardians on this subject; but if representations were made to me that any particular officer is by reason of old age unfit for the discharge of his duties I would give the matter my attention.

Unpublished Reciprocal Agreements with Foreign Powers.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has given any pledges or entered into any reciprocal agreements with any Foreign Power in regard to China or Japan, of which this House has not been made cognisant; whether it has given any such pledges or entered into any such reciprocal agreements in regard to the Mediterranean or to any country abutting on it with any Foreign Power of which this House has not been made cognisant.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) I venture to hope that the hon. Gentleman will forgive me if I am only able to reply that I have no statement to make upon the inquiry which he has addressed to me. Any other reply, he will allow me to say, would be contrary to public interest.

Ireland—Conduct of Police at Rathcormac.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork Co., N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the action of the police at Rathcormac on the 9th instant, on the occasion of a Gaelic tournament held in a paddock rented for the purpose by the President of the Gaelic Club, when a head constable and some policemen refused to pay for admission, and forced an entrance into the paddock; and, seeing that meetings of the Gaelic Club for various sports are held in Rathcormac week after week, will the police be instructed to exercise more discretion with regard to them in future.

(*Answered by Mr Wyndham.*) The police did not use any force in entering the field, and no objection was taken to their presence by the owner. On many occasions disturbances arising out of these tournaments have taken place, and it was deemed prudent to have police in attendance at the meeting in question. They do not unnecessarily intrude on such occasions.

Army Recruiting Since Close of the War.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of recruits, exclusive of re-engaging Reservists, who have been enlisted, since the conclusion of the South African War, for the Regulars and Militia respectively, specifying in each case the numbers for each arm of the Service, and, in the case of the Infantry, the number of specials.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The following statement shows the number of recruits who have been enlisted since the conclusion of the South African War to 1st November, for the Regulars and Militia respectively:—Regulars: Household Cavalry, 62; Cavalry of the Line, 2,912; Royal Artillery, 5,157; Royal Engineers, 626; Foot Guards, 701; Infantry of the Line, 11,054; Army Service Corps, 484; Army Ordnance Corps, 172; Royal Army Medical Corps, 352; Total, † 21,520. Militia: Royal Artillery, 1,217; Royal Engineers, 148; Infantry, 13,736; Royal Army Medical Corps, 197; Total, 15,298. It is not possible to obtain figures for a broken period as to the number of specials without obtaining returns from all the districts, for which I am not prepared to call.

Recruiting—Physical Standards.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the physical standards for recruits enlisted for the Regular and Militia forces have been raised since the introduction of the higher rates of pay; and, if so, in what particulars.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The higher rates of pay have not yet come fully into force. The standard of height has been raised in the case of the Hussars from a minimum of 5 feet 2 inches to 5 feet 4 inches. All other physical standards for recruits remain unchanged.

British Honduras — Mr. Fenwick's Explorations.

COLONEL SADLER (Middlesbrough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received the report of Mr. Fenwick's explorations and discoveries in British Honduras; and whether the names of the places discovered will be published in the British Honduras Government Gazette.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I have received a Report on the subject of the hon. Member's Question. Mr. Fenwick does not appear to have added to the existing knowledge of the Colony.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Further Financial Assistance for the Boers.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received a request for further financial assistance to the burghers of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony in addition to the sum already voted by Parliament; and whether he proposes to confer with the Boer generals on the subject.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have no expectation of any further interview before I leave for South Africa. The views of the generals and my reply will be found in Cd. 1284.

Volunteer Officers.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state why a distinction was drawn between the Volunteer officers who went out to South Africa at the beginning of the war and those sent out between six and eighteen months before it was terminated, to the detriment of the latter in respect both of leave and pay, which were granted on landing to the one and withheld from the other; why Volunteer officers from the Mother Country were less liberally treated than Colonial officers in regard to decorations; and whether it is intended to continue the requirement that officers holding His Majesty's Commission in the auxiliary forces must be sworn in by recruiting sergeants as private soldiers, and answer the questions in the attestation papers, before obtaining temporary commissions in the Regular army.

---

† Exclusive of 964 re-enlisted under Army Orders 106 of 1900 and 59 of 1901.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): As regards the first part of the Question, no such distinction was drawn. The Volunteer officers who returned with their units were given a month's leave with pay for the purpose of settling up with their men; those who came home individually were released from service from the date of disembarkation, unless retained in South Africa for the public service, when they were given a month's leave from date of disembarkation. As regards the second part, my right hon. friend gave the hon. Member a full reply to a Question which he put on the 12th instant,† to which I have nothing to add. As regards the third part, the practice was discontinued in 1900.

MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E. R., Buckrose): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War with respect to the Volunteer officers employed in South Africa and who were mentioned in despatches and received rewards, if he will state the number of these officers who served with Volunteer companies and engineer detachments.

LORD STANLEY: I will obtain the information requested by the hon. Member.

King's S uth African Medal.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that, owing to the conditions under which the King's South African medal is granted, some of the Auxiliary forces are debarred from receiving it, the conditions may be so amended that all those who served in South Africa during any portion of His Majesty's reign may receive the medal.

LORD STANLEY: Will the hon. Member kindly refer to my right hon. friend's reply to a Question put by my friend the hon. Member for York, on Monday last,† wherein it was stated clearly that there was no intention of altering the regulations.

Imperial Yeomanry—Medals.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that certain of the battalions of Imperial Yeomanry that went to South Africa in 1902 arrived there too late for the grant of the Queen's medal, in consequence of the fact that they had been kept at Aldershot two months longer than it was stated would be the case in the warrant under which they enlisted, the same medal could be given to them as was given to the Militia employed at Malta.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir; this medal was given for service in the Mediterranean, and is not applicable to South African service.

MR. YERBURGH: I shall take the earliest opportunity of drawing attention to this matter.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the Government not grant them some medal?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

Reservists.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Reservists who took part in the South African Campaign, and left the colours with an exemplary, very good, or good character, are to be re-admitted to the Army if so desirous and able to pass the medical examination, without distinction as to the date of transfer to the Reserve.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. They must have been transferred or re-transferred to the Reserve between the 1st June, 1902, and the 1st January, 1903, the object being to aid those soldiers who, owing to the large numbers discharged at the same time, find a difficulty in obtaining employment.

---

† See page 746.

† See page 1118.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: May I ask whether consideration cannot be given to the case of men discharged in April last, who find great difficulty in obaining employment, and were misled by the public announcement?

LORD STANLEY: I do not think they need have been misled. I will mention the case to my right hon. friend, but these men had three or four clear months in which to get employment before the mass of the Reservists came home.

Army Entrance Examinations.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hants, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that inconvenience is being caused to the public schools and other educational establishments by the uncertainty which now prevails as to the future syllabus of the Army entrance examinations; and whether he can now announce his intentions with regard to the syllabus unanimously recommended by the Military Education Committee.

LORD STANLEY: I am most anxious to obviate any avoidable inconvenience, but the subject is a very important one, and I can only say that full time will be given before any change is brought into operation.

Welsh and New Zealand Coal.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state how Welsh and New Zealand coal compare in the relation of bulk to weight, and in the effective development of steam; what percentage less weight of New Zealand coal can be stowed in a given bunker space, and how much more effective is a given weight of Welsh coal in developing steam; and if he can state approximately the actual and percentage difference in price between Welsh and New Zealand coal delivered at the China Station during the last few months.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Admiralty do not think it is in the public interest to furnish detailed particulars with regard to the coal actually carried on ships of war. The results of trials made in foreign countries are not communicated to the Admiralty. I must ask, therefore, to be excused answering the hon. Member's Question.

H.M.S. "Cressy."

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will give the results of any recent full speed trials by His Majesty's armoured twin crew cruiser "Cressy," made with New Zealand or other coal.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No report has yet been received at the Admiralty o any speed trial by H.M.S. "Cressy" during the present year. The last full speed trial of which the results are known took place in October, 1901, before the vessel left for the China Station.

H.M.S. "Hyacinth."

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the nature of the defects in the machinery of H.M.S. "Hyacinth" which prevent her having her new trial with H.M.S. "Minerva."

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There are no defects in the machinery of H.M.S. "Hyacinth" which prevent her from proceeding with trials with H.M.S. "Minerva." As the object of these particular trials is to test various propellers of different form and dimensions, some time is necessarily occupied between the trials in changing the propeller blades.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: May I ask the hon. Gentleman why proper screws were not designed for this ship at first?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. Member knows that the question of screws is one which is being experimented on in almost every country, and we are experimenting in order to ascertain if better results are to be obtained from these screws than from the original ones.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: The powers of the screws have been known for years, and no more experiments are necessary.

British Trade in the French Congo.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the effect on British trade in the French Congo of the grant of exclusive rights of proprietorship and trade by the French Government to the concessionaires, who now demand the expulsion of British firms from the country; and whether he can state what progress has been made with the negotiations with the French Government relative to the claims of British subjects for restitution and compensation.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): His Majesty's Government recognise that this is a matter of great importance to British trade. It has for some time past been the subject of negotiation with France, and definite proposals are now under the consideration of the French Government.

Kabyle Revolt in Morocco.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to convey to the House respecting the Kabyle revolt in Morocco, and the steps taken by His Majesty's Government to protect British interests in that quarter.

LORD CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Minister at Tangier reported by telegraph on the 12th instant that the Borgu tribe near Tetuan had cut the road and stopped traffic between that town and Tangier, on account of the Governor of Tetuan refusing to release some people of their tribe. Sir A. Nicolson does not appear to anticipate any serious trouble at present. We shall, however, be in a position to send ships in order to protect British life and property should occasion arise.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: How can effective protection be afforded by British ships to persons in the interior?

Aliens in London.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many aliens have been charged at Metropolitan police courts in the last twelve months; and if, having regard to the number of criminal cases throughout the country in which aliens are concerned, he will consider the desirability of acquiring the power of expelling from the country aliens who have made themselves amenable to the criminal law; and further, what steps are being taken to prevent persons expelled from Belgium and other Continental States in consequence of anarchist outrages settling in London and other British centres in the absence of any other State consenting to receive them.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): During the twelve months ending the 31st October last, 4,943 persons of foreign nationality were charged at the Metropolitan police courts. As regards the second and third paragraphs of the Question, it would be premature to make any statement or express an opinion as to the desirability of legislation pending the Report of the Royal Commission which is now inquiring into the whole question of alien immigration.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Can the hon. Gentleman say whether these figures show an increase on those for the previous year?

MR. COCHRANE: I cannot say.

Police Overcoats.

MR. HENRY J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state why the constables on duty in Palace Yard, on Monday 17th November, were obliged, having regard to the state of the weather, to remain on duty without greatcoats. The hon. Member added: It is not suggested that any complaint was made by any of the men concerned.

MR. COCHRANE: There was no such obligation as the hon. Member suggests. On the contrary, instructions that the men should wear greatcoats were issued early on the day mentioned by the responsible officer.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then why did not the men obey orders?

Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom from 1887 to 1901, including figures to 31st March, 1902, was distributed to Members on 10th October, 1902; and can he make arrangements whereby these accounts may henceforth be distributed at a less interval than six months after the close of the period which they embrace.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The distribution of the United Kingdom Abstract was to some extent delayed this year owing to special circumstances connected with the revision of some of the financial Tables—circumstances which it is hoped will not recur. Every effort is made and shall be made to issue the Abstract as early as possible.

Post Office Telephones.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is yet in a position to say when the extension of the Post Office Telephone System throughout the metropolis and suburbs will be complete; will he state the amount expended by the Post Office up to the present time on this service, the number of subscribers, and the amount of their rentals.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E): Seven Post Office Telephone Exchanges have already been opened in London since the 1st March. These serve districts which include more than half the previous users of telephones. Four other exchanges to serve large areas are well advanced. Owing to the rapidly increasing demand for a telephone service, it is not practicable to name a date when the system can be regarded as complete. The authorised expenditure on works now in progress is in round figures £1,261,000. These works provide not only for the service of existing subscribers, but to a much greater extent for future requirements. The number of subscribers' telephones now working is 5,160, and this number is being increased by from 150 to 200 a week. The receipts in respect of the local exchange service in London up to the 15th instant were £34,473, and £1,086 was received for trunk calls made by Post Office subscribers.

MR. LOUGH: Are these new subscribers put into communication with the subscribers of the National Telephone Company?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir; that follows from the terms of the agreement which the House had under discussion early in the year.

Supervision of Postal Officials by their Relatives.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether a member of the family of the postmaster at Londonderry was recently supervised at Gravesend and Douglas, Isle of Man, by another member of the same family; whether this official was recently temporarily transferred to Belfast from Douglas, and subsequently to Londonderry; and whether he can state the result of any inquiries that have been made into these matters.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A daughter of the postmaster of Londonderry was attached to the Gravesend and Douglas post offices, of which her father was postmaster. She has been recently transferred temporarily to Belfast and to Londonderry. Although the Department does not generally regard it as satisfactory that an officer should have to supervise a member of his own family, I do not think it necessary to insist in all cases that a daughter of a postmaster should be excluded from her father's office.

Education Bill—Evening Elementary Schools.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the provisions of the Education Bill, 1902, under which local education authorities are compelled to provide elementary public school accommodation, extend to the provision of evening elementary schools under Clause 18 of the Bill as reprinted.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The effect of sub-Section (1), Clause 18, of the Bill, will need consideration; but it does not appear that the duty to provide public elementary school accommodation under the Bill extends to the provision of evening elementary schools under that sub-Section.

Welsh Intermediate Education.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will state whether the powers vested in the County Council under sub-Section (*a*) of Clause 13 of the Education Bill could under any circumstances, through the operation of sub-Section 7 of Clause 12 of the Bill, as amended, be applied to any parish or parishes in Wales or Monmouthshire.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The County Councils in Wales and Monmouthshire will have the powers given by sub-Section (*a*), Clause 13 (1) of the Bill, with regard to expenses incurred under the Bill. But the provisions of Clause 13 of the Bill will not apply to money spent under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889. The effect of sub-Section (7) of Clause 12 of the Bill is merely to alter the constitution of the body who administer the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, not to alter the actual provisions of the Act.

Bagnalstown Petty Sessions Summonses.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Bernard Kennedy *v.* Michael Moore at the Bagnalstown Petty Sessions, in which the Royal Irish Constabulary claimed the right to serve summonses for the Petty Sessions Court at Bagnalstown in cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners; and whether he will issue instructions to the police to have these summonses served by the proper officer employed by the Town Commissioners.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): It has hitherto been the practice of the constabulary to serve summonses in these cases. That course was adopted to convenience the Town Commissioners. If, however, the Commissioners desire that summonses in all cases in which they are complainants, should be served by their own officer, no objection will be raised by the constabulary.

Recorder's Court, Dublin.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the delay and expense caused to suitors by the accumulation of cases in the Recorder's Court in Dublin; and whether, in order to obviate this public inconvenience he would be prepared to introduce a new Clause into the Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill extending the jurisdiction of the Court of Conscience from £2 to its former limit of £10.

MR. ATKINSON: I am not aware that there has been any accumulation of cases in the Recorder's Court in Dublin. Whether the jurisdiction of the Court of Conscience should be extended is a matter for consideration, but any reform of the existing procedure would not be germane to the Bill.

Bagnalstown Water Supply.

MR. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board have received reports from the Bagnalstown medical officer as to the necessity of a water supply for that township; whether they have made any inquiry into these complaints; and what action they propose to take to insist upon the local authorities providing a water supply for the inhabitants.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The question of improving the water supply for this township is at present under the consideration of the district council, at whose instance a local committee is investigating the matter.

Newbridge Artisans' Cottages.

MR. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Board of Works have refused to issue the final instalment on the loan for artisans' cottages in Newbridge to Kildare; and whether, in view of the public inconvenience thus created, he will direct the balance of the loan to be issued without further delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board of Works has not refused to issue the loan. The local authority has not yet completed the forms necessary to enable the Local Government Board to recommend the issue.

Inspector Fleming and the Thomastown Guardians.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Inspector General has received any complaints from the Board of Guardians of Thomastown Union as to the recent action of District Inspector Fleming, and to the fact that he has relatives living in the district; and what has been the result of the inquiry into this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: These complaints have formed the subject of a correspondence between the guardians and the Inspector General, whose decision had been communicated to the guardians. If the hon. Member has not seen the correspondence, I shall be glad to send him a copy.

Belfast Revaluation.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names, qualifications, previous experience, and previous employment, and the salaries paid to the valuers employed by the Commissioner of Valuation in making the recent revaluation of Belfast.

MR. WYNDHAM: This information is being tabulated and, when completed, will be communicated to the hon. Member.

Rating Appeals.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many appeals have been made to the county court judges during the last twelve months against rating valuations made by the revisers under the new system of valuations; how many valuations have been decreased on appeal; and in how many has the original valuation been upheld.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no new system of valuation in force in Ireland. The number of appeals to Quarter Sessions during the past twelve months was fifty-seven. Changes were made by the county court judges in eighteen cases; I am inquiring as to the nature of the changes made.

Tallow Conspiracy Case.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names of the officials referred to by the Lord Chief Baron in the case of O'Keeffe *v.* Walsh and others, of Tallow, as having failed in the discharge of their public duties; and, if not, whether any public inquiry will be held into this matter with a view to discovering the parties responsible.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. I am not prepared to debate the course pursued by the Executive more than three years ago by way of Question and Answer in this House.

MR. TULLY: Why are not these officials prosecuted for breach of trust?

Imprisoned Irish Members.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state if Members of Parliament sentenced to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, are permitted during their imprisonment to receive their Parliamentary Papers and to communicate with the authorities of this House as to Amendments and Notices of Motions standing in their names; and, if not, whether he will direct any modification of the prison rules in this respect.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; the prison rules do not, I am advised, admit of the privileges referred to. It is not proposed to alter the rules, which are identical with those in force in English prisons.

Education Bill—Sham Trust Deeds.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will introduce provisions into the Education Bill, as was done in the case of The Finance Act, 1894, to prevent sham trust deeds being executed with a view to evading the provisions of the Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I take it that if a trust deed is a sham it will not be upheld by the Courts, and no special provision is required in this Bill to provide against it.

Religious Instruction in Schools.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether sub-Section (4) of Clause 8 of the Education Bill would subject the decisions of the managers of voluntary schools in regard to religious instruction to an appeal to episcopal authority where the trust deeds at present provide for it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Without attempting to interpret the hon. Gentleman's phrase "the decisions of the managers," I may observe that wherever a trust deed gives an appeal to the bishop to determine whether the teaching is or is not in conformity with the trust deed, that appeal will still remain obligatory.

MR. TREVELYAN: Will there be any appeal to the Board of Education from the bishops?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I take it that the Board of Education will be quite out of this.

MR. TREVELYAN: Will there be any circumstances under that sub-Section in which there will be an appeal to the Board of Education?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps it was rash to do so in answer to a Question without notice, but I have indicated my opinion for what it is worth, without consulting the exact phraseology of the Bill, that there will be no appeal to the Board of Education with regard to religious instruction. I do not believe there will be any such appeal.

Gibraltar.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is now able to say whether the Report of the engineer sent to report on the harbour on the eastern side of the Rock recommended by the Gibraltar Committee in March 1901 will be laid upon the Table of this House; and, if so, when; and, if it will not be laid, can he state generally what course His Majesty's Government intend to take in order to render Gibraltar tenable, and to keep it open as a naval station.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; I have much pleasure in informing the hon. Member that the Report can be laid immediately.

Appropriation Accounts.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the Civil Service Appropriation Accounts for the year ending 31st March only reach the Comptroller and Auditor General on the next 30th November, and that the Army and Navy Appropriation Accounts for the same period only reach him by 31st December; and whether these intervals of eight months and nine months respectively can be shortened and the accounts delivered earlier, so as to admit of a more complete examination of them by the Comptroller and Auditor General before he presents his Reports thereon to the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the dates 30th November and 31st December are fixed by the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act of 1866. The Comptroller and Auditor General is not limited in the examination of the accounts to the time after he has received them in a complete form. The accounts of the spending Departments are rendered monthly, and so his examination of them proceeds throughout the financial year, while in the largest Department he has his own officers permanently located for the work. I understand the Comptroller and Auditor General himself has no complaint to make of the time allowed.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I would like to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the dates are fixed in the Act only as the limit beyond which the time shall not be extended.

National Finance Accounts.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, is he aware that the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom for the year ending 31st March, 1902, and ordered by the House to be printed on 23rd June, 1902, were not distributed till 31st August, 1902; and can he make arrangements so to expedite the future printing and distribution of these Accounts that they may be distributed at a less interval than five months after the close of the period they include.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Finance Accounts include the final Returns of revenue for the expiring year, which, coming as they do from all parts of the United Kingdom, require many adjustments, and cannot be ready until some time after the close of the financial year. The printing of the accounts has to be done at a time when the pressure on the Government is considerable, but although every effort will be made to expedite their distribution I am afraid I should be holding out false hopes if I promised any great acceleration.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Managers)—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*)—brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

(2.35.) MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said there ought to be some discussion as to the generally unsatisfactory character of this Clause before they came to the Amendments. On examination of this Management Clause they found it to be as narrowly denominational as it could possibly be. The trusts, as at present constituted, were of various characters, but in general they would either leave the appointment of the managers in the hands of the incumbent or else in the hands of the subscribers to the school. But one of the first things likely to occur as a result of this Bill was that the subscribers would become nonentities. At every stage of the Bill money was being put into the hands of the managers, thereby relieving them of the necessity for seeking subscriptions; and where now there were perhaps twenty or thirty subscribers giving a pound apiece, in future there would only be two or three. The rest of the money required for repairs would be obtained from other sources, such as the rent of the schoolmaster's house and from endowments, which, by the action of the Committee on the previous day, were largely put into the hands of the managers. The result of the disappearance of the subscribers would be that the appointment of the foundation managers would be in the hands of the parson in a great many more cases than at present. In many cases there would be no subscribers left, except the incumbent and his curate, who would for form's sake remain a subscriber to the school. This appeared to him to be a very unsatisfactory condition of things to perpetuate. What would happen with a large number of the villages, where at the present time persons other than friends of the incumbent were chosen to serve on voluntary school committees? This Bill had created in the minds of the clergy a presumption of hostility between themselves and the popular managers; and, in future, the parson, where he had the power, would do his best to choose four managers who would uphold his particular views and would follow his lead absolutely. He would deem that necessary, because he would regard the two managers chosen by the public as hostile to himself. The four foundation managers would probably be the parson, his favourite curate, the wife of the squire, whom he could depend upon to give an annual tea to the children, and one of the churchwardens. He contended that the members of the denominations concerned ought to have more freedom in the selection of managers, and that there ought not to be left so much power in the hands of the incumbent of the parish. Was there any reason why two of the managers should not be appointed by communicants of the Church to which the school belonged? It would maintain the essential spirit of the trust. It would be very unfortunate if in future the managers were chosen from "the inner ring" of the parish, controlled by the parson. He had in his mind a case which occurred in the North of England in which the parson, because of his very High Church proclivities, lost nearly the whole of his congregation, and merely preached to the squirearchy of the county, who came from long distances in order to listen to his eloquent sermons. The people of the parish went elsewhere. But what would be the condition of things in a case like that? The incumbent would practically have the appointment of the whole of the four managers, and surely it would be better if his parishioners had a right to select at least two of them. It certainly would cause less friction. He hoped the scope of the Clause would be widened so as to ensure that the denominational managers were more truly representative.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) hoped the Prime Minister would be kind enough to explain to the Committee how it was proposed to work this Clause. No one would know how to go about the appointment of the four denominational managers. It would be very difficult to make the appointments in accordance with the present trust deeds, because one of the constituencies named by the trust deeds—namely, the subscribers to the schools—would exist no longer, as there would be no need for subscriptions. The First Lord had on innumerable occasions told them that one of the main objects of the Bill was to destroy what had been called the one-man management of the school, but by practically placing the appointment of all four denominational managers in the hands of the incumbent they were deliberately giving more power to the one man than he had ever before had. It was bound to create a great amount of friction. It was not a healthy state of things that the majority of the managers of a school should owe their position to the nomination of the incumbent. The best people would not accept office on such terms; men and women of independent character certainly could not do so.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) thought the First Lord would admit that the Clause required a good deal of amendment, even from his own point of view. What was the Government's idea as to these appointments? Under the model trust deed of the National Society which dominated the majority of the Anglican schools the management was vested in the clergyman of the parish and his curate or curates. There were to be four denominational managers under the Bill, so that where the incumbent had three curates he and his curates would fill the four places. As a rule in country parishes the incumbent had one curate. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."]

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): In the majority of cases the clergyman of the parish has no assistance.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Does the hon. Member tell me that in the vast majority of cases the clergyman has not assistance in the way of a curate?

MR. MALCOLM: Yes

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would accept that statement from the hon. Member, but at any rate in thousands of parishes the clergyman had a curate; in those cases half the denominational managers would be clerical. How were the others to be appointed? Under the model trust deed any vacancy was to be filled by election by the subscribers of 10s. and upwards of the current year. The Clause passed yesterday destroyed that constituency. There would no longer be any need for subscribers now that the only burden on the managers was the repairs. To bear that burden the managers would have the rent of the schoolmaster's house, which would alone be a larger sum than was generally represented by the subscriptions.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are very few schoolmaster's houses in towns.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am dealing with rural districts.

MR. MALCOLM: And in many rural districts they have not a teacher's house.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he accepted the hon. Member as an authority on curates, but on this point he could not agree with him. His hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell informed him that out of

14,000 voluntary schools, there were 8,494 to which schoolmasters' houses were attached, and the rent of these buildings would provide a fund for repairs. In these cases certainly the subscribers were not needed. The second fund arose out of the endowments, and in many cases the endowments, unless they were earmarked for the school teacher's salary, would be at the absolute discretion of the trustees for the fabric and repairs. These two funds would render it unnecessary to appeal for subscriptions. [An HON. MEMBER: Then there are the fees.] With the fees there would be three funds which would enable them to dispense absolutely with subscribers. Supposing that they wanted a few pounds in cases where there were no endowments and no schoolmaster's house, what would happen? A big sum was not wanted, but a sufficient sum of money for the purpose. The clergyman would fix his own constituency. He would settle down with his curate to make out a list of the men who would probably subscribe. The curate might suggest Mr. So-and-So, because he was a rich man. The clergyman naturally wanted the control of his school. There was a good deal of human nature in Holy Orders. He would object to the gentleman named by the curate because he was a Low Churchman whose views did not correspond with his own. He would then pick out the members of his congregation of either sex who would be most amenable to his influence. All he had to do was to go to four or five members of the congregation who were his best supporters. He would ask them to put down £1 each, and the men so picked out would elect the managers in the district. But to say that this method of selection represented even the denomination itself was a perfect farce. Since the Government had decided that schools should be denominational let them be frankly so. Let them really represent the denomination. Did they propose that the trust deeds should remain as they were, the clergyman *ex officio* with power to appoint his own curate or curates, and the balance to come from the subscribers whom the clergyman himself selected? In the event of there being no subscribers at all, how did the Government mean to provide a constituency to elect the managers?

(3.2.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Perhaps it will be for the convenience of the Committee that I should now reply on the points raised by the hon. Member for the Elland Division and the hon. Member for Carnarvon. A great deal of the argument of their speech is based on the assumption that no subscriptions or sacrifices will be required in future from those who support the voluntary schools. Well, as a friend of the voluntary schools, I almost wish that were the case, but I am afraid that it is very far from being so, and that it will be found when the Bill comes into operation that the idea that the various denominations interested in these schools will have to make no sacrifices to keep up the schools is an idea which has no foundation in fact. There may be here and there exceptionally constituted schools where the contributions of predecessors have put the schools in so good a position that they do not require to ask the existing generation to put its hand into its pocket to carry out the work of the schools. It is quite true that such cases exist. Cases exist, no doubt, where the endowments are of so large a character that the school is independent of outside support, or where the managers or trustees of the school were possessors of the fee simple of the schoolmaster's house, which they turned to some account. But though these cases undoubtedly exist, the broad fact remains that this Bill, while it does relieve much of the strain that presses on the managers of voluntary schools, and while it removes that particular kind of competition with rate-aided schools, of which the managers of voluntary schools have so long and bitterly complained, does put undoubtedly upon the managers of denominational schools the duty and the necessity of still deriving funds from private sources in order that the schools may remain allocated to the denomination. Therefore I would venture to point out to the hon. Gentlemen who have spoken, that the financial basis on which they have proceeded is one which does not correspond to the actual facts of the case. I put the same conclusion in still more precise and explicit language. It is quite clear to me that it is a mistake to suppose that we have destroyed the constituency based on contributions to the school. It may be that annual subscriptions are not required in the same sense as before, but contributions undoubtedly will be required, and I see no reason why, in the schemes to be presented to the Education Department, the managers may not suggest a constituency, modified in some detail, but having for its basis the willingness of the constituency to subscribe for the support of the school of the denomination to which they belong.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Who does the Prime Minister suggest they should be?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course it is impossible to suggest who would be the people who would subscribe to the cost of any of the schools in the district, but it is perfectly possible, while modifying the trust deeds, to maintain, if not the precise provisions of the trust deeds, at all events, something on the same lines. I see no inherent difficulty in doing it. The hon. Gentleman gave a sketch of what he supposes will be the constitution of the Board with its four denominational managers. He said that the trust deed of the National Society contemplated, in the first place, that the clergyman shall be *ex officio* a trustee, to which, in the case of a Church school, I think nobody would object. He further stated that the clergyman might appoint the curate, if he has only one, two curates if he has two, and three curates if he has three; the result of which manipulation of the body of managers would be that all the four managers would be gentlemen of his convictions. I cannot conceive that that would be the actual operation of the Clause we are now discussing. Of course, as the House knows, the normal board of management will consist of six members, four of them being necessarily denominational; but we do not limit by the Bill the possible number to six. Six is the contemplated number, but there are cases in which that would be exceeded, and if the number of six is greatly exceeded I do not see why there should not be more than one clergyman on that extended number. But I should be sorry to see an immense clerical preponderance on the board of management, and certainly that would be attained if the hon. Gentleman's prophecy were fulfilled. But I cannot believe either that the existing trustees would present any such scheme to the Board of Education for their approval, or that the Board of Education would be disposed to agree to it if there were three clergymen out of a body of four denominational managers on the general board of management. That certainly is not contemplated. It is the business of the Board of Education to have regard to the general scope of the intentions of the trust deeds, but I cannot see that such an arrangement would be desired by the National Society, or sanctioned by the Board of Education. One of the difficulties which must always be borne in mind is that the Clause is necessarily wide and indefinite in its character, because the number of trust deeds to be dealt with are almost infinite in their variety. If we had simply a single form of trust deed to deal with, this House might have a free hand to take it into consideration, to state the way in which we intend to preserve the spirit of that trust deed, and to say, in view of the general provisions of the Bill, that we propose that such and such modifications should be made. That would be a possible policy, and it might be the right policy if we had only one form, but as we have to deal with an infinite variety of trust deeds, I think we must draw the framework of this Clause so as to give the discretion of the Education Department and the existing managers the widest possible latitude. I think it was the hon. Member for the Elland Division who asked "what becomes of your protestations about one man management?" My answer is very plain. My answer in the first place is that one man management means, I presume, management by one man. For that we substitute management by six men. That, at all events, will be a considerable change. It is said that this is all a pretence and a delusion, because one is the clergyman and the others are the nominees of the clergyman. Why should there be this view of the relations between the various members of the Church? I cannot think that these men will all be dismissible by the parson, and, therefore, surely I am justified in repeating what I said before. In the first place, this Bill substitutes six men management for one man management, and in the next place it puts on the board two men who have no relation to the original trust deed of the school, and there is no reason to suppose that in regard to the four remaining managers there will not be sufficient breadth and elasticity of arrangement so as to make them properly representative of the denomination to which they belong.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that one part of the speech of the Prime Minister he could not, for the life of him, understand. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that in such a case as had been put by the hon. Member for Carnarvon, where there would be more than one clerical manager that matter would be dealt with by the Board of Education.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Under a scheme?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The word scheme is not used in this Clause, but, of course it is contemplated that the proposal would be made to the Board of Education, which would have something to say as to the constitution of the new body of managers.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: No, Sir, that would not occur at all. The case put would be consistent with the trust deed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I think not.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: It is the commonest thing in the world for two clerical managers to act.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If we had cut down the denominational managers to four, then it would not be consistent that two or three of these should be clerical members. It would have been different in cases where the board of managers consisted, as was sometimes the case formerly, of fourteen or sixteen members.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE said that that was an entirely new rendering of this Clause; and there again he was sure that the Clause would have to be interpreted by the Courts. It had never occurred to him that the case put by his hon. friend would be inconsistent with the trust deed. He did not think it was. There was nothing about the spirit of the trust deed in the Clause. If the Clause were read perfectly carefully, as it was now before the Committee, it would be seen that it had to be shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Education that the provisions of the trust deed as to the appointment of managers were in any respect inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, etc. The ordinary case was where they were consistent. The ordinary case was that the managers were to be communicant members of the Church of England and, in some cases, that they were to be communicant members of the Church of England and subscribers. He believed that it would be held by any court of law that the clergyman and the curate could continue to be put on the board of managers. In the ordinary rural parish there were only three managers. The forms attached to the church doors were more commonly signed by three persons than by any larger number, and of these three, sometimes two were clergymen and one a county gentleman or a leading farmer. He was sure there was nothing inconsistent with that in the spirit or letter of the trust deed. He could not think that the explanation of the Prime Minister was right on that point. Then, as to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman that under the Bill things would go on as now in regard to Church management. Their point was that things did not go at all. At the present time there was no constituency. All that was done was that the clergyman asked two people to sign the forms with him. But they were starting afresh and introducing some form of public management of these schools and responsibility of management, and surely his hon. friend was right in saying that in doing so they ought to create some sort of a constituency. In his hon. friend's supposed case it was to be a Church constituency, subject to the conditions of the trust deed. There were two cases which commonly existed at the present time. First, that in which there was no management except one-man management. The second was worthy of the consideration of the Committee, because it was common in populous parishes where there were small manufactures. In that second case there was a body of managers of Church Schools, but then the trust deed was not adhered to. Although the trust deed said that the managers must be communicant members of the Church of England, as a matter of fact some of them were Nonconformists. He knew of a case where two of the managers of Church Schools were Wesleyans. Of course that had been done with the view of securing liberal subscriptions from Nonconformists. In another case where the management had been so far popularised, the treasurer of a Nonconformist School was also manager of a Church School! That was more popular management, but it was inconsistent with the trust deed. Both these cases pointed in the same direction, and showed that they ought to create a real constituency.

* MR. MALCOLM said he wished to apologise to the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs for having interrupted him in the course of his speech, but he was rather led to it by what he considered the exaggerated statements of the hon. Gentleman. There were certain cases of wrong or hardship, but these were the exceptions; and it would be a pity to proceed with legislation on the assumption that the exception made the rule instead of proving it. The hon. Member for Carnarvon said that it was possible under the trust deed for the parson and three curates to form all the denominational members of the board of management, and then the hon. Gentleman proceeded to argue that in all the country districts of England the parson was blessed with one, two, or three curates. Now, he would point out that almost half the country parishes had not got a curate as well as a vicar, that in a small minority there were only two curates and a vicar, and that in scarcely any at all were there a vicar and three curates. He thought that these facts would puncture in some degree the contention of the hon. Gentleman. Then the hon. Member for Carnarvon went on to point out what a conspiracy there would be between the vicar and his curates to get control over the school endowments; but in many parishes they had no other endowments than the school house, while in the towns very few of the parishes had school-houses; so that both from a rural and a town point of view the hon. Member had been misinformed. The hon. Member for North Camberwell said that in 8,000 parishes there were school houses, but he inferred that many of these were board school houses [Dr. MACNAMARA: No; voluntary school houses.] He hoped that the general case against the Government Bill would be more accurately stated in future, in order that the country might know the facts of the situation and the great difficulties with which the Government had to contend.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said he was led to suppose from the hon. Member for Stowmarket that his case was much more the exception than he anticipated, because the country parish with which he was most familiar had one curate, also a schoolmaster's house which could not be claimed under this Bill; and the school had an endowment of £20 a year. His parish might be from that point of view more favourably situated than the generality; but it must not be supposed that the ordinary type of parish had not a curate and a schoolmaster's house as well. He did think that the country parish with one curate was not at all an exception. [Mr. MALCOLM: I said one half.] If they could have had a Return of the number of voluntary schools throughout the country, giving the composition of the managers and how far they were under clerical control, it would have astonished many hon. Members.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that six months ago he had asked for such a Return, and the Government actually refused to give it.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that there were a large number of instances in which the managers were nominated by one man, and he was quite sure that the figures of such a Return would have been a revelation to Members of the House. They had been told that a breach was to be made by this Bill in one-man management, and he understood that the Prime Minister had said that a breach ought to be made in the practice of one-man nomination of the majority of the board of managers. But what he wanted to know was. How was that to be carried out? So far as they could see, this Clause increased the power of one-man nomination, because the amount of subscriptions was to be diminished. They were going to give a large additional sum out of the public funds for the purposes for which the subscriptions were required before, and by diminishing the subscriptions they were placing into the hands of one man, in a great number of cases, the power of nomination of the whole board of managers. He knew of one instance where the board of managers was entirely at the disposal of the vicar, who said that he was anxious to give that board of managers a broader foundation. That was to be done by giving a nomination of one manager to the Parish Council; but when the Parish Council inquired into the matter they found that whoever they elected as manager must remain at the disposal of the vicar. How was that going to be altered under the present Bill? The Prime Minister said that there would not be a clerical preponderance on the board of management, but the majority would be clerical nominees. He did not see that the Prime Minister made out his case. Supposing the man who hitherto nominated the whole board continued to nominate four-sixths of the Board, how would there be anything in that inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill? That could only be cured by widening the constituency from which the managers were to be selected. The Committee might or might not accept the particular constituency, proposed by his hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs; personally, he should support it. But what he contended for now was some sort of constituency, and unless the Government could see their way to introduce something in the nature of a constituency, then they on that side of the House should propose a constituency for themselves. The case for widening the trust deeds, and for not being bound by the provisions of the trust deeds was an immensely strong one. The foundation managers would not be solely appointed for the purposes of the trust; they would be the executive of the local education authority. The trust deeds were drawn up before the State had taken on itself the duties of education. The situation now would be entirely altered. The trustees to be nominated under the trust deeds were to be invested with powers of a far wider character; and the only fair way of compromising, in the public interest, was, while securing the denominational education demanded where the trust deed required it, and foundation managers of a particular denomination, to introduce an element of a constituency which would give some guarantee that these managers, in carrying out the provisions of their trust, would be people who would be worthy to be the executive of the local education authority, and who would feel that they had responsibilities, not merely under the provisions of the trust deeds, but to the wishes of the parents themselves in a particular parish.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said he rose, not so much for the purpose of answering the criticisms from the other side of the House, as to point out one or two things relevant to the discussion. The idea on the other side of the House appeared to him to be that it was just and fair to take full advantage of the existence of school buildings built for a particular purpose and use them to the utmost for educational purposes, and yet not have any regard for the intentions of those who had built and supported those buildings as expressed in the trust deeds. That appeared to him to be a most unfair principle. If the State wanted the buildings, they ought to pay for them. But that was not the principle of the present Bill, and it was rather late to enter on that now. The present Bill contemplated using the buildings without paying for them; therefore, they must be used subject to the provisions of the trust. That was an argument he was entitled to use; it was not an argument which his right hon. friend could use; because he had already disregarded, or attempted to disregard, the trust deeds on a very important point. The Government would least of all be able to claim that they had been faithful to the principle of the trust deeds. They had disregarded and violated them; and, in the process, they had disregarded, violated and outraged the religious convictions of a great portion of their supporters. That was so. But if they had a grievance against the Government in respect of that and other matters, they were not blind to the fact, which was very clearly emphasised in the debate that evening, that there might be another Government still worse. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Berwick Division was likely to be the most moderate Member of any Government that could possibly take the place of the present Government. Yet, the right hon. Gentleman thought it would be quite legitimate to upset the trust deeds, and have a constituency giving some form of popular control, which had been already rejected in Clause 7. Before, however, the system set up in this Clause could come into operation and a new set of managers were appointed some months must elapse. If any change of Government were to take place, if—he was sorry to put so lugubrious a hypothesis—a distinguished Member of the present Government were to die in the interval, the whole situation might be changed, and the whole of the denominational schools throughout the country would be at the mercy of those who succeeded. He really thought that that was a position open to criticism by those interested in denominational schools. It was to be observed that there was to be some obscure, yet undefined, power given to the managers over religious instruction in the schools. Therefore, the matter was more important than it was before that ill-fated Friday when the Government turned their backs on their own principles, and admitted the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. That being so, there was ground for the very keenest anxiety. If anything happened to the Government between now and the time those orders came into force, every denominational school in the country might lose its character. Therefore, he earnestly pressed on the Government to consider whether it was fair to those who had built the denominational schools and had supported them, to leave the whole character of those schools at the disposal of any Board of Education which might come into existence between now and next July. That was a very haphazard way of legislating. He did not want to press the Government now; and owing to the situation in which they were placed through the action of hon. Gentlemen opposite, he was very reluctant to move Amendments at that stage; but he hoped the Government would consider whether it would not be possible to introduce some provision which would allay the very reasonable apprehension which was entertained. If a hostile Board of Education came into power every denominational school in the country would be altogether changed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he sympathised with his noble friend, who had evidently spoken under the stress of contending emotions. His noble friend was in some doubt, he gathered, whether the Government were more to be reproached for their imaginary change of front, of which he complained, or their reckless dealing with trust deeds; or whether, on the other hand, their preservation was more to be prayed for in order that an even worse Government might not come into existence within the next few months. If his noble friend could suggest any reasonable alteration consistent with their view of their own Bill, which was different from his noble friend's view of the Bill, which would carry out the object which his noble friend and himself had in common, the Government would gladly consider it; but, apart from that, and until he saw that Amendment, he would only say he would do all he could to preserve his own health and that of his colleagues.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that the right hon. Gentleman had given expression to a purpose with which the Committee would heartily concur; and he might, perhaps, congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the fact that the time was approaching when the debates would no longer expose him to the strain which had excited the apprehension of the noble Lord. He must leave the noble Lord and the Government to settle between themselves the grievance of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. He really did not know that that deadly arrow had struck so deep; and he supposed they should hear more about it at a later stage. He should, however, like to assure the noble Lord as to what would happen if another Government came into power. Looking at the Clause, he could not imagine that there could be any considerable discretion given to the Board of Education. It was perfectly clear that, under the Clause, the trust deeds would go on as they were going on now; and that it would have practically no application except in cases where there was no trust deed. If there was a trust deed which could be made compatible with the Bill, it would continue to exist. It was also plain that there would be no power on the part of the Board of Education to alter a deed, unless it contained provisions inconsistent with the Act; and that would, he believed, be only in a small minority of instances. The result would be that practically the powers exercised under the trust deeds hitherto would continue to exist. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that in the majority of cases there was now one-man management; but that one-man management would continue because the clergyman would have the power of appointing. What difference would there be whether he appointed his wife or his daughter or his churchwarden?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked in how many cases would the clergyman have that power.

MR. BRYCE said he gathered the clergyman would have that power in a great many cases. The one-man management would continue on account of the facts of rural life. There were three kinds of rural parishes. There was the parish in which there was conflict, which he was afraid would be more acute under the Bill; there was the parish in which the clergyman enjoyed the complete confidence of the laity of his own church, and in which things would go on as at present; and there was the parish—and it was in a great majority—where there was neither conflict nor harmony, but apathy. Thirty years ago the clergyman, speaking generally, was the only man who cared about the education of the parish, and he had a great incentive to making his management effective. He had a strong spiritual motive. The Kenyon-Slaney Amendment showed how exceedingly keen and warm and strenuous were the feelings of the district in a large section of parishes with regard to the spiritual prerogative of the clergyman, and wherever the clergyman was able he would use that spiritual prerogative to his utmost in the endeavour to get three other managers on the Board who would conform to his views. One could not complain of that, because he would be acting according to his conscientious convictions. But it was for that reason, because there were so few people in the rural parishes who cared for education or who took the trouble to watch over the clergyman, that he believed the one-man management would continue. The charge on subscriptions was a perfectly insignificant charge. He had endeavoured to get an estimate of the charge on subscriptions. In a district covering 100 children it would be very small indeed; it would be a charge quite easy for four or five people to meet, without any strain, out of their own pockets. Added to that there was the fact that in 8400 of these schools they had the rents of the school houses, and in at least 1500 there were endowments and school fees. So that in one half of the voluntary schools there were other funds from which the cost of repairs could be defrayed without touching the subscriptions. He believed the thing would remain, so far as the Bill was concerned, even more in the hands of a small number of persons than heretofore, because hitherto it had been necessary to call for subscriptions from a wider area than now. One other observation suggested itself to him. For twenty-five years they had had in the House a demand, which had latterly become less articulate and less effective, for some recognition of the power of the laity in the Church of England. If one who belonged to another country and was able to look dispassionately at these matters might express his feeling, he would say that it was a pity that in this Bill some better recognition was not given to the rights of the laity. The view of the right hon. Gentleman opposite was that the Bill was promoted to secure that denominational teaching which the Church, as a whole, desired. He was sure he did not ignore the laity, but the Bill did. If it did not, it would have provided for a universal rule under which in every parish, whatever the terms of the trust deed, there should have been an election by members of the Church of England in the parish of these denominational managers. If that had been adopted it would have rendered the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment entirely unnecessary. If the right hon. Gentleman would even now admit an Amendment to that effect he would do a better stroke for the Bill than any he had yet done. He was convinced that would be the best way of solving the difficulty, and therefore, in the interest of peace in the Church of England and in the interest of the rights of the laity he very much regretted that some such course had not been taken.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that the words of the Clause as to the provisions of the trust deed being in any respect inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill obviously pointed to those, the great majority of cases, in which the deed provided for a larger number of managers than was allowed under the Bill. In the great majority of these trust deeds four managers were provided for. The principal task of the Board of Education would be to cut down the number of managers, and he thought they might look to that Department to see that the claims of the clergy and the laity were properly balanced. One very important aspect of the question had not been discussed, and that was the very large number of cases in which there were no trust deeds. How were the Board of Education going to meet such cases? He would be glad to have a little more light thrown upon that. This brought them to a set of cases in which there was no trust deed and the school was private property, which might be diverted to any other purpose by the owner at any time. It was very curious that there was no allusion to the owner of a school throughout. He thought that some words would have to be inserted directing the Board of Education to have regard to ownership in these schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR appealed to the House to bring the discussion on this Amendment to a conclusion.

(3.55.) DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) regretted he could not accede to the request of the right hon. Gentleman. His case against the Clause was that where there was no proper constituency the Clause did not create one, and that where there was a constituency it would destroy it. The Prime Minister had said that the broad fact remained in the Bill that the duty and necessity of still providing proper funds for the repair of denominational schools would rest on the denominational managers. That was true of the original form of the Bill. But from March 24th right down to the present moment it was notorious that the Church, through its leaders, had been attempting to whittle away the financial obligations which had been put upon it by the Bill. As the Bill now stood, the Government had destroyed the constituency by taking away any obligation to maintain voluntary contributions. As the Bill originally stood, there was a considerable obligation on the managers to maintain the fabric out of voluntary contributions, but the obligation had now been practically removed. ["No, no."] First of all, under the Clause adopted on the preceding day the managers were to have a considerable pull on the income from endowments. That income amounted to £151,000. He could not say how much the managers would get of that sum, but whatever the amount, it would go towards the upkeep of the fabric. Then there was the rent from voluntary school teachers' houses, of which there were 8,494. Most of those houses were in the country, and worth, perhaps, only £4 or £5 a year, but those in the towns were worth £25 or £30. Even at the moderate figure of £5 each, the rents would amount to more than £42,000. Then the next Clause to be considered proposed to give the managers a right to a share of the school fees, which in the past had gone to the relief of local rates, and had amounted to £232,000. In addition to that, the Board of Education had agreed that in future there should be fees in night schools. Therefore, from endowments, rents and school fees, there was roughly £500,000 of money, which, together with the £800,000 in voluntary subscriptions, made £1,250,000 upon which the managers would have some claim under the Bill. He had gone carefully into the question of the cost of maintaining the fabric, and considered that an average of 2s. per head would amply meet the charge.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) pointed out that, according to the last Report of the London School Board, the charge was 5s. 3d. per head.

DR. MACNAMARA thought the hon. Member must surely be aware that all charges in connection with building operations and so forth were much higher in London than in the country. He could point to hundreds of cases in rural districts where the expenditure per child was not more than a penny or twopence, and the Committee might rest assured that 2s. was a generous estimate. On 3,000,000 children, that worked out at £300,000 for the upkeep of the fabric—a charge which could be easily met out of the share of the £1,250,000 given to the managers in the manner he had described, with a considerable sum left over to form a building fund for future use in connection with Clauses 9, 10 and 11. According to the model Clause now in existence, in all respects other than the superintendence of the religious and moral instruction of the scholars, the control and management of these schools was to be vested in and exercised by a Committee, consisting of the principal officiating minister of the district, his licensed curate or curates, and a certain number of other persons who continued to be contributors to the amount of 20s. a year. With this obligation to maintain the fabric practically removed, how many of such contributors would there be? The constituency was practically destroyed, and they would have to fall back on the clerical element. The Prime Minister was doubtless sincere in saying he did not want the clerical element to dominate the schools, but as the result of this Clause, the schools would be so dominated, because the only constituency by which a lay element could be secured was destroyed. He hoped that before the Clause was passed, it would be so modified as to secure a fair amount of lay representation on the trust management of these denominational schools.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) said it was generally recognised that the more popular the management the better was the education, but under this Clause all idea of popularising the management of denominational schools was given up. As the hon. Member for North Camberwell had conclusively shown, voluntary subscriptions would practically be unnecessary in the future. That being so, under the provisions of the trust deeds, they would go back to the bad system of one man management—either directly by one man, or by one man and his nominees. The great bulk of the trust deeds would still be consistent with the principles of this Bill, and the managers would be appointed under the provisions of those trust deeds, which meant they would be appointed by the clergyman. In the event of there being no trust deeds, how did the Board of Education propose to proceed? On what principle would the Board provide either trust deeds or for the election of managers? As the existing constituency was to be destroyed, would the Board map out a constituency in the various areas by which managers should be elected, or would they themselves appoint managers? The Clause was extremely vague, and the Committee ought to have some information on this point.

(4.13.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 554.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Groves, James Grimble

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (D'rlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl

Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C, E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbigh)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(4.25.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said they had been discussing the question of the constituency that should elect new foundation managers. He wished to make it clear why he was selecting a constituency which was a denominational one. He took it that the decision of the House had been that these managers must be denominational managers. The question was what was a proper denominational constituency for the election of the four managers of a denominational trust? He selected two different bodies. First of all, the parents. The whole case in favour of dogmatic religious teaching had been that it was the demand of the parents. They argued that the parents wanted to bring up their children in their own faith. He knew the state of things that existed in Wales, and he understood that in England about four-fifths of the parents were not concerned much about any faith at all. In Liverpool about 90 per cent. of the population were outside any place of worship on Sundays at the morning or afternoon service. The accommodation in London would only provide for one-fifth of the whole population, so that if they crowded all the churches in London they would have four-fifths of the population outside. It was an extraordinary thing that these places he had mentioned were the keenest about providing dogmatic teaching for the people of Wales, although they did not attend their own places of worship. The people who did not care enough about dogmas to subscribe a penny towards religion in London, nevertheless returned Members to Parliament who demanded that the ratepayers of Wales should give definite religious teaching to their children just to save them from paganism. Was there any other basis on which the Prime Minister, or any other defender of the sectarian faith, could justify this proposal except that the parents wanted their children brought up in a certain faith? The parent was the best judge, and no one had a right to judge for him. The parent was the guardian of the spiritual interest of his child. If the parent did not want his child brought up in any particular faith why should it be forced upon him by outsiders? Why not leave the parent himself to select? The subscribers had been gradually wiped out by several Acts of Parliament of which the present Bill before the Committee was the climax. The subscriber had been gradually abolished. He suggested that the parents should select two of the managers for the purpose of administering the trusts in which they had a much larger interest than anyone else. It was a great mistake—and the noble Lord opposite was constantly making it—to assume that the only interest they had got in a school was the interest they had in the subscriptions. The most precious interest was that which the parent had got in the faith of his child. If they were going to give the subscriber of 10s. the right to manage the school and to declare what sort of instruction was to be given in it, the man who sent his child to the school had a right to a voice in declaring what sort of instruction should be given, and especially what sort of religious instruction he wished his child to have. Now he came to the second branch of his Amendment. They should not leave it to the minister practically to elect his own colleagues. This was carrying co-operation rather too far. The Prime Minister would not trust the County Council to this extent. The right hon. Gentleman would not trust one member of the County Council to elect the whole of his colleagues, but that was practically what he was doing with regard to the Board of Management. With all the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman, his reply on that matter was very inadequate and slightly irrelevant. He respectfully challenged the Prime Minister to point to anything in the trust deed that would diminish the one-man power of the clergyman. The clergyman selected the curate, and he could select the subscribers. Really, this was very important, because the whole thing turned on it. The clergyman was cognisant of the needs of the school, and if he wanted £10 he would pick out the people who would subscribe the amount. If anyone went to him and obtruded a subscription on him—a very unusual thing in any kind of business—he might refuse it. He might say that he had already got his £10 and that he did not want more. The hon. Member asked the Prime Minister to say whether the clergyman could refuse a subscription. In any case, he need not collect subscriptions every year; and the trust deed said that the elected managers were to be elected by "the subscribers of the current year." On the question of the denominational character of the management the Committee had decided; but, accepting that decision, he urged that the laity as well as the clergy should be represented. Otherwise, it was a perfect imposture to put this proposal forward as anything but clerical control.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, at the beginning, to insert the words 'Two of.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member, in moving his Amendment, told us both at the beginning and the end of his speech that he frankly accepted, for the purpose of argument, the decision at which the Committee arrived earlier in the debate that four of the managers should be foundation managers, but either I misunderstood his speech or misunderstood his Amendment, for I thought the first part of the hon. Member's speech advocated not denominational management, but management including two representatives of the parents irrespective of their denomination.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I accepted for the purpose of argument the statement of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, that the parents were eager for denominational teaching.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman will admit, I think, that it is part of the complaint he makes against the whole of the Bill that in many Church schools in the country there are children whose parents do not belong to the denomination.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE indicated dissent.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the actual fact. It has never been denied by any of the advocates of the Bill, and it has been undoubtedly proved by the opponents. It is a notorious fact. These grievances exist sometimes on one side and sometimes on another. The hon. Gentleman will admit that if his Amendment were carried it would not secure that denominational representation of four foundation managers which he professes to be ready to take for the purpose of argument. I do not deal further with that branch of the Amendment because I think it is dealt with in the tenour of the hon. Member's own speech. The remaining part is directed at preventing what the hon. Member regards as absolute clerical domination over the four foundation managers. I am quite unable to understand from the hon. Member's explanation what there is in the normal trust deed of the National Society to give the clergyman this power of nominating all his colleagues for the foundation management. The hon. Gentleman said that the clergyman would hardly ever require subscriptions, and if he did they would be very small in amount. He said that all the clergyman would have to do would be to go to some subservient person in his parish——

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Sympathetic, rather.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Some sympathetic person in the parish and say to him "Give me 10s. or £1," or whatever is the qualifying sum, and in that way get a constituency who would only return persons in absolute sympathy with himself. I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman. The task which will devolve upon the managers of the National Society's schools is that of devising a scheme which will as far as possible carry out the intentions of the trust deed. Now the intentions of the deed of that society are plain on the face of it. They are not intended to give clerical control or a clerical majority on the managing body. It is perfectly true, as the hon. Gentleman has pointed out, that the clergyman of the parish is *ex officio* a member. It is also true that he may appoint his curate or curates as managers. There might be on the board of management one, two, or possibly three clergymen, but the number of managers of whom this clerical element would form a part was a large and indefinite number. There is no question under present circumstances of dominating any large body of subscribers, and therefore what the National Society managers will have to do is to try to frame a scheme in which the four denominational representatives shall be a reflection of the kind of body contemplated by the original trust deed, and as that original trust deed does not contemplate a clerically dominated body, so I hope the reflection or copy of that trust deed, which will be embodied in the future trustees or governing body of the schools, will not be any more than its prototype clerically controlled or with a clerical majority. Therefore I do not think that the hon. Gentleman is justified in his contention. I do not think I need go any further in the matter. I do not think the hon. Gentleman in his speech, whatever may be said of the Amendment, described the actual kind of constituency he would wish to have for the election of denominational managers, I content myself with the hon. Gentleman's speech, and with showing, I hope with some force, that just as the existing trust deeds of the National Society are not intended to give this clerical domination of which he is afraid, so the trust deeds which are to replace them will be framed on the same model and will be intended to carry out the same result.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that what they desired was that the Government should make some suggestion as to the manner in which the managers would be selected. The right hon. Gentleman did not really seem to appreciate the point of the Amendment. In a large number of cases at the present moment there was a good deal of elasticity in the working of the trust, and managers were brought in who did not fulfil the conditions of the trusts. If this Clause passed as it stood the managers would be the persons signified by the trust deed. He did not wish to go over again the arguments which had been so admirably stated, but it was quite obvious that this possibility of choice would be very much limited indeed, for it would not be necessary for a particular school to have so many subscribers as in the past. The hon. Member for Stowmarket said that there was no conspiracy on the part of the clergy on this matter. He did not wish to impute any blame as to why there had been one-man management hitherto; but what the hon. Member opposite wanted to retain was that one-man system, while what they on that side of the House desired was to bring the lay element into the management. There were many cases where it had been very difficult to bring on to the board of managers a man of independent mind. The possibility of choice by the clergyman would be so limited that practically all the foundation members would be under his control. It seemed to him that the Clause, as it stood, was contrary to the spirit of the Bill, and even to what the Government desired; and he hoped that even now the Government would enlarge the letter of the Bill by which the trustees would not be absolutely limited in their choice. There was no doubt that of the four denominational managers there might be two clericals and in some, cases three. The Chairman was to have a casting vote, so that all that was necessary was that the Chairman should secure the appointment of two supporters, and that would give him a permanent majority. Another important point was that it was desirable to have the lay element on the board of management, and the only way in which that could be secured in small country districts would be by enlarging the terms of the trust.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said they were all agreed on one point, and that was that the model trust deed would remain in force after this Bill became an Act of Parliament. The question, therefore, was how this trust deed would operate in rural parishes. Any one who read the trust deed knew that the qualification of a manager was very difficult to attain. First, a candidate for managership must subscribe 20s., and the franchise for the election of a manager was a subscription of 10s. for every manager the subscriber wished to vote for. That franchise was very much out of date and ought not any longer to remain in the country. He understood that where the trust deed could not be carried out in its entirety it was, according to the Chancery doctrine of *cy pres*, to be carried out as near as possible. So far as he understood, this Bill was intended by the First Lord to remove what he called an intolerable strain—which was the subscriptions — from the shoulders of the subscribers who had to bear it. If that were so, what became of those subscriptions and subscribers? They knew now that the voluntary schools had a fund at their disposal sufficient to meet their requirements, and even to leave a profit. When that took place the necessary successors of the subscribers were the ratepayers, and the power of the subscribers ought really to fall into the hands of the ratepayers. The First Lord said that they ought to disregard the trust deeds, but he thought they ought to enforce them, for there was a certain popular element in them. The First Lord admitted that under the trust deeds one-man management was possible; but what was wanted to be enforced was that there should be some general popular denominational element amongst the four members elected by the denomination. They wanted to make these four members not representative of any one man in the parish, but of the denomination itself; and he thought it ought not to be beyond the wit of man to devise some scheme whereby that would be secured. There were representatives of the Protestant Laymen's League in the House, and surely these Gentlemen were anxious that the Protestant laymen should be represented on the board of managers. He asked the hon. Member for East Toxteth, where the Laymen's League was particularly strong, was he really content with the Government scheme on this point? Did he not think that there should be some popular element in the choice of these four denominational managers? It was quite true that in a great many parishes the majority of the parents were Nonconformists, although their children attended the Church schools. But it was open to the hon. Gentleman to move an Amendment to the Amendment, that the parents who elected the denominational managers should belong to the denomination. They had heard of the inalienable rights of the parents, and here was a case where some justice could be done to them.

SIR EDWARD GREY said there seemed to be a misunderstanding between the two sides of the Committee as to what the intention of the Clause was, and he should like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education which was the right interpretation. He really thought the hon. Member for Carnarvon had based his Amendment on the assumption that what would happen in a certain number of cases, after this Clause was passed, would be, that under the typical National Society's trust deeds, where subscriptions would be no longer required, the incumbent would remain the one person nominated by the trust deed on the Committee of managers, but three other managers were to be appointed, and in a case where the subscriptions which had been given were withdrawn, and there were no subscribers left, the incumbent would have it in his power to select those three by simply going to three different people in the parish and saying, "If you will each give 20s. you will become the other three managers." In that way those three would be his nominees, and if he should be displeased with any one of them, all he would have to do would be to say that he did not want his £1, and to apply for the amount from somebody else. Their reading of this Clause was that after the Bill was passed, the appointment of managers under the trust deeds would go on automatically as before, except in a case where the Board of Education was appealed to on the ground that the trust deed was inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. The reply of the First Lord of the Treasury was that in every such case the Board of Education would draw up or approve a scheme. But where was that to be found in the Bill? The Board would have to approve a scheme for the appointment of a committee, but not every scheme for management. His contention was, that except in exceptional cases, where there were no trust deeds, or where the management under a trust deed was inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill, the Board would not come into the matter.

(5.5.) MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) thought it was no doubt the case that under this Bill a great number of Orders would have to be made, as had been suggested by the right hon. Member for East Somerset, and, under those circumstances, asked whether it would not be worth while to endeavour to arrive at some uniform system. He admitted that the effect of the Bill would be to somewhat diminish the danger of clerical domination. But the question now was, the old constituency being destroyed, how should a new constituency be created? Much was heard of the rights of the laity and their lack of interest in Church matters, and so long as the clergyman remained the autocrat in the parish it was difficult for a Church layman to take such interest. The clergyman was very apt to talk of "my" parish, "my" church, and "my" school, though, on the financial side, it was "your" debt. But debt after the Bill passed would become non-existent and subscribers unnecessary, and he agreed with his hon. friend that two managers should be elected from the parents of children attending the school. But among the strong supporters of this Bill there were some who cared a good deal more for the unalienable right of the parson to dominate everything in the parish than anything else. The probability of the representatives of parents being Nonconformists, and their appointment being inimical to the denominational character of the school, would only arise where there was but the one school amid a population largely Nonconformists, and in such a case he should be prepared to say, let the denominational character of the school cease. It was only fair that the parents of the children attending the school should have a voice in the management.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON, in reply to the right hon. Baronet, said that where the foundation managers were neither more nor less than the number mentioned in the Bill, there would be no further trouble, and no necessity for application to the Board of Education; but if the managers were too many or too few, or if there was no trust deed, upon application made, the Board would follow the trust deed as closely as possible, or the past system so far as it was in conformity with the Bill, so as to obtain four foundation managers.

MR. TREVELYAN gave an instance of a school in the South of England where the voluntary subscriptions amounted to £60, all subscribed by two or three people, and where the managers were elected by virtue of their being subscribers. As a result of the introduction of the Bill, all the subscribers had fallen off except one, and the clergyman was in a position to select his own managers. What would happen in the future would be not the one-man management of which they had heard so much, but more black-cassock management. The "grouping" Clause would further increase the tendency to clerical control, because where six or seven parishes were grouped together for the purposes of appointing one Committee of management, it was not unreasonable to suppose that the clergyman of each particular parish would insist upon being put on the Committee. What were the Government afraid of? Unless there was very good reason for not doing so, parents and communicants would naturally desire that the clergyman should be appointed to the management. After the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment the other side need not be in the least afraid of outside unclerical members coming on the board of management.

LORD HUGH CECIL said he did not think hon. Gentlemen opposite who had suggested a great number of cases in which difficulties would arise had sufficiently considered how overwhelming were the difficulties in the way of their proposal or any possible proposal on the same lines. As to their suggestion that the other managers, apart from the incumbent, should be representatives of the denomination, if they had been following closely the controversy about Church reform for the last four years, they would know that nothing was so difficult as to say who was and who was not entitled to be regarded as a member of the Church of England. A great many people were anxious to increase the power of the laity in the Church, but in order to determine who were the persons who ought to have extended powers in the management of the Church itself, they must first determine who the laity were, and to attempt to do that by a Clause in this Bill would lead to widespread opposition. Then it was said, why not fall back on the parent? It was perfectly true that the rights of a parent over his child were the greatest rights that could be conceived. But a parent, because he was a parent, had no rights over other people's children. His position was very different from that of a citizen. A citizen was part of a larger whole, and in respect of the whole had certain rights, and therefore there was no impropriety in a majority of citizens determining what was good for a minority of citizens. Therefore they could not have the system of the representation of the laity until they determined who the laity were, and they could not have representation of the parents, because the parents' rights were purely individual over his own children, and consequently they must fall back upon the trust deed, on respect for which the Clause was founded.

MR. BRYCE said he always listened with considerable interest to the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, because he always tried to bring back the Committee to questions of principle, and more particularly on this occasion because the noble Lord had said two things well worth the saying. He had pointed out how excessively difficult it was to find what the definition of a member of the Church of England was, but the difficulty of finding a definition of what constituted a member of the Church of England, did not alter the general proposition that there ought to be lay control. If the Government admitted that, it was for them to suggest a method which would give some satisfaction to the claims of the laity. He did not gather from the noble Lord whether the laity should be represented or not.

LORD HUGH CECIL said, as the Bill stood at present, that would depend largely on the trust deed.

MR. BRYCE said the trust deed was simply a document which determined the destination of certain property, and he denied that the right of looking after bricks and mortar was to prevail over the lives, wishes, and liberties of individual living men. He was sick and tired of hearing this right of property continually brought forward as if it was to supersede and over-ride the rights of living beings. He would far rather buy out or rent the school. The right hon. Gentleman said that was not the scheme of the Bill, but if the Government would come forward with a proposition of that sort, they would find there would be no difficulty about the money. The bricks and mortar would not stand in the way of what was called for in the interests of justice. The argument of the noble Lord as to the rights of parents being individual was very subtle, but because parents might conceivably have different wishes with regard to their children, were all the rights of the parent to be altogether extinguished and denied because he was an individual man, without the right of saying what should be done with regard to every other individual man's child? The idea was absurd. Parents were a kind of solidarity, and, speaking broadly, the wishes of the parents belonging to the Church of England were substantially the same. They would only obtain substantial justice if they adopted the representative system. Therefore, the dilemma put by the noble Lord did not touch the needs of the case. It was no answer to the proposal, and the only answer that could be made by the Government was a better proposal which would more adequately meet the wishes of the parents. Until that was given they would continue to ask for a scheme, and, in default of receiving one, they put forward this scheme, which was better than nothing. With regard to what had been said by the Secretary to the Board of Education as to the cases where there might be too many managers or too few, in the former case, he supposed, the simple course would be to cut off one. In that case the existing system would remain, and the clergyman would retain such right of nomination as he at present possessed. If there were too few managers, he assumed that one or two would be added in the same manner as persons were now elected, viz., by the subscribers. In neither of those cases would there be any change from the present system; and all that had been said on that side of the House about the position of subscribers, about the clergyman being able to have many or few subscribers as he pleased, and about the subscribers being few and probably immediately connected with the clergyman, still held good, as the management would be substantially the same as in the past. He assumed, and he thought they had a right to assume after the events of the last fortnight, that every possible advantage would be taken by the clergy of the power given into their hands by the letter of the law, and therefore it might fairly be taken from the answer of the Secretary to the Board of Education that the system would remain substantially unchanged.

(5.32.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that one satisfactory feature of the debate was that it had definitely put an end to the assertion made earlier in the proceedings that the one-man system of management was not interfered with by the Bill.

MR. BRYCE dissented.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY did not understand the right hon. Gentleman to repeat the assertion.

MR. BRYCE said he repeated it in another form.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought it was hardly possible for the assertion to be repeated after this debate. First, there was the control of the local education authority over all the secular part of the education; secondly, on the board of managers, who had the control of the religious education, there were two managers nominated by the local authority; and, thirdly, the clergyman would be one of four foundation managers—there being three others who would certainly put an end to the idea that, even as regarded the foundation managers, it was simply a case of one-man management. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen had entered into the question of whether the alternative scheme of buying out the Church schools would not have been better than the scheme in the Bill. But to a sale there must be two parties. It was not enough for a person to be willing to buy; the owner must be ready to sell. If the owners of the Church schools valued the distinctive teaching for which the schools were established so highly that they declined to sell, what was to be done? Were they to be forcibly expropriated? Was Parliament to take these schools, which were provided for one purpose, and apply them to another, thereby violating convictions strongly entertained by those interested in the schools? He ventured to say that the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that that was a feasible solution of the difficulty was one which would be rejected by the bulk of Members on his own side who would object to the expense, and by those on the Government side who were interested in the maintenance of the distinctive principles for the teaching of which these schools existed.

MR. BRYCE said he did not give it as his suggestion. What he said was that the Government ought to have made the offer. The First Lord of the Treasury had spoken as if the difficulty in the way was these schools, but, as he had not made such an offer, he was not entitled to say that that was the difficulty.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought the considerations to which he had adverted were a sufficient explanation of why such an offer was not made. It was totally impracticable, and would have been rejected by the common-sense of both sides of the House. With regard to the alleged difficulty of framing schemes for the election of foundation managers in the future, he would point out that the provision that the clergyman was to be *ex officio* a member and was to appoint his curates, was only a portion of a trust deed which contemplated a considerable number of other managers. The National Society's trust deeds provided that there should be original managers—subscribers—and that future vacancies were to be filled up by election by the body of subscribers. So that, as compared with the body provided for in the Bill, a committee of considerable dimensions was there contemplated. The presence of the clergyman, even with two or three curates, on a large body of that kind, was not at all of the same significance as it would be on a body in which there were only four foundation managers. The effect of any order made by the Board of Education under this Clause would be as far as possible to reflect the true intent and purport of the trust deed, although, of course, it would have to be modified to meet the changed circumstances. It would not fairly represent the effect of the trust deed if, where there were only four managers, it gave three places to the clergyman and his two curates. Obviously, if anything like the proportion contemplated in the Bill was to be preserved, provision would have to be made by which the representation of lay subscribers provided for in the trust deed was perpetuated.

MR. BRYCE put the case of a trust deed which contemplated five managers, of whom the clergyman was given power to nominate one, and asked whether, in the view of the Attorney General, when those five managers were reduced to four, the clergyman's power of nomination should be taken away.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY did not think it desirable to enter into details of how any particular case should be dealt with. It was sufficient, at the present stage, to say that the function of the Board of Education would be to make an order that would fairly carry out the true intent of the trust deed, having regard to the altered circumstances. Then the right hon. Gentleman appeared to contemplate that, in future, in a great many cases, there would be no subscribers.

MR. BRYCE: That there would be very few.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY apprehended that in future there would be a considerable demand for the purpose of meeting the cost of repairs. There might be individual parishes so happily situated in regard to endowments applicable to repairs that subscriptions would be wanted either not at all, or to a very small extent, but throughout the county generally he thought there would be a large demand to meet the cost of the repairs thrown on the managers by this Bill. It was not for him to forecast the future, but one of the possibilities certainly was that the churches interested in these schools would find it convenient to establish something in the nature of a central fund, either for the whole country, or for considerable districts, to which subscriptions might be paid. It was quite within the range of reason that subscriptions might be given either for the repairs of an individual school, or to a central fund available, as required for the repair of any school within the sphere of the operations of the fund. He did not say whether it would be done or not. It would be for the Board of Education to determine these matters according to the circumstances of the case, but it would be perfectly practicable to say that those who were willing to enter into a legal obligation to subscribe, when required, a certain sum per annum for the purpose of repairs, should count as subscribers, as also should those persons resident in the district served by a particular school who agreed to subscribe either to the particular school or to a central fund available for the purposes of the school. He threw out these suggestions simply to show that the difficulties were not by any means to be assumed to be of the nature supposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but he felt tolerably confident that the questions, as they arose, would really solve themselves, and that there would not be any great difficulty in making the necessary orders.

MR. BRYCE asked, in reference to the hon. and learned Member's last suggestion, whether, if there was a diocesan school repair association, the members of the association would be entitled to vote for the managers of a particular school.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said his suggestion did not go to that extent. It was simply that they might be considered as subscribers for the purpose of electing members of the board of a particular school any persons resident in the district served by that school who had entered into an obligation to pay a reasonable subscription, although that subscription might go to a central fund, so long as the fund was available for the purposes of that school.

MR. BRYCE: A diocesan fund?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY did not care by what name the fund was called—whether central, diocesan, or anything else. He really could not see that the difficulties were so terrible as hon. Members seemed to apprehend.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the Attorney General had made two suggestions, one of which was very happy and the other far less happy. He had suggested that in the case of a trust deed which provided for a managing body of twelve, of whom three were *ex officio*, when that the number of foundation managers was reduced to four, the *ex officio* element should be reduced proportionately. That was a principle the adoption of which by the Board of Education would work greatly to the advantage of education. But when the hon. and learned Member went on to foreshadow the possibility of the subscribers in a given parish, not to the funds of the parish school, but to a diocesan fund for all the schools in the diocese, being regarded under the terms of an order as subscribers for the purpose of electing managers of a particular school, he opened the door to a very dangerous proceeding. He hoped the suggestion was not to be regarded as coming with any official force, or as being in the nature of an official forecast of the future policy of the Board of Education. He had applied to these proposals a standard which would measure not how far the Bill fell short of their ideal but how far it went in advance of the actual state of things. It was something to provide that there should be a committee of a fixed size, one element of which would consist of representative persons. This committee would meet regularly and perform its business according to a schedule, and that would be a distinct advance upon the actual state of things at the present time. He understood that this committee was attacked on the Opposition side of the House for not being sufficiently representative and public in its character, and it was attacked on the Ministerial side from below the gangway because it provided for a possible state of things in which the rights of the trust deeds and the clergymen would be overridden. He was bound to say that in this matter of the education of the children the rights of the trust deeds or the rights of the clergymen ought not to override the rights of the parents of the children attending those schools. He protested against any fetish contained in trust deeds being allowed to override the rights of the people of the present day. He wished to say one or two words about what had been claimed as the rights of the clergy. He did not deny that in the rural parishes of England—he did not think it was true so much of the urban parishes—the clergyman had shown himself to be the person most interested in education, and he had given a very large amount of time and a disproportionate amount of his stipend and salary to that purpose. Of the voluntary contributors, the man who had given by far the most in proportion to his means, had not been the wealthy layman but the clergyman. In many cases they had done this out of a sincere regard for the welfare of education and out of a sincere conviction that the principles of the Church of England were the best for the children. But Parliament were now confronting a new issue. They were now dealing with a Bill which proposed to reorganise the local control of elementary schools, and the contention that the services of the clergy in the past entitled them to render the same services in the future, and that the trust deeds must not be affected, was hardly appropriate to the present situation. They were discussing now a new method of local control for denominational schools, and in so doing they had a right to consider as a new departure what was the proper method to adopt. The question was whether there was to be amongst the foundation managers a representative of the parents. He had had some experience of one or two cases where it was provided by the trust deed that a certain element of the managers should be appointed by the parents of the scholars. His experience had not been that the parents of the scholars had been particularly anxious to serve. He did not know that the parents of children attending public elementary schools made at all ideal representatives in the management of the schools, but he was sure that they made a better representative element than no representatives at all. He agreed that the parental element was not the best possible element from the public and representative point of view, but nevertheless it was an advance upon what was proposed by the Government, and he should therefore vote for the Amendment. He wished to renew his protest against the idea that the parent was to have no rights in the matter while the clergyman was to have rights over all the children in the parish. The noble Lord opposite claimed such rights for the clergyman, and why? Simply because he was the clergyman of the parish. The clergyman had certain parochial rights, but he thought it was time that they eliminated clerical rights from the schools, and placed the management upon a proper basis. The whole cost of management now came from the popular purse, and the managers ought to be drawn from the popular will, and neither the rights of the clergy nor the terms of the trust deeds should be allowed to stand in the way.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he rose to have a point cleared up. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, in a speech he made a very short time ago, said that if the trust deed provided for a smaller number, say three trustees, it would then be the duty of the Board of Education to make an Order varying the trust deed and making the number up to four. He wished to ask the Attorney General whether that was so. If that was the case he wished to know under what particular provision of the Bill that result was arrived at. In the Clause under discussion it would be seen that the power of the Board of Education to make an Order depended upon whether—

> "It is shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Education that the provisions of the trust deed as to the appointment of managers are in any respect inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, or insufficient or inapplicable for the purpose, or that there is no such trust deed available, the Board of Education shall make an Order under this section for the purpose of meeting the case."

What did the Act say about endowments? Sub-Section 2 of Clause 7 provided that—

> "All public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority shall, in place of the existing managers, have a body of managers consisting of a number of foundation managers, not exceeding four, appointed as provided by this Act."

Therefore he should have thought that the Board of Education would have had no power to vary such trust deeds or to increase the number from three to four.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said his right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University had pointed out that the provision made in Section 7 was that the number of foundation managers was not to exceed four. The question of having four might arise if there were to be two managers representing the local authority. He thought his right hon. friend had omitted to notice that if the appointment of managers was insufficient or inapplicable for the purpose then the Board of Education would make an Order to meet the case. If it were necessary that there should be four managers no provision would have to be made unless it was in order to keep up the balance of representation.

SIR JOHN GORST said he wished to point out an example which would be an extremely common case. There were a number of cases where the trustees were the vicar and churchwardens. Take for example a Welsh parish where the great majority of the people were Nonconformists. The vicar and the churchwardens would be the foundation managers of the school. Presumably the vicar and his churchwardens would be Churchmen. The County and Village Council might put on two other managers, who would presumably be Nonconformists. They would then have a Board of Managers consisting of three Churchmen and two Nonconformists. At Easter, when the people's churchwarden came to be elected, there was nothing to prevent another Nonconformist being elected, and then they would have this school managed by three Churchmen and three Nonconformists. In this case what became of the two-thirds majority which they were promised?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY contended that the Board of Education could rectify such a case by the making of an Order.

SIR JOHN GORST: Under what provision of the Act could they do that?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: There is provision made for the making of such an Order—

> "On the application of the existing trustees or managers of the school made within a period of three months after the passing of this Act."

It was for the Board of Education to say whether in such a case the provision of the trust deed would not be deemed insufficient or inapplicable for the purpose.

(6 0.) MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said he thought the argument of the Attorney General was entirely unsound, and did not constitute an answer to the point raised by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that they on this side of the House had at some period abandoned the argument that under the provisions of the Bill the Government would still be perpetuating one-man management. They had not abandoned that argument. He preferred another phrase, however. What they were now objecting to was the perpetuation of clerical management. The interesting speech of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich illustrated the difficulty in which they were, and in which they must continue to be if they were going to preserve these denominational schools for ever. The noble Lord said it was impossible to know who was a member of the Church of England and who was not. The hon. Member believed that theoretically he was himself a member of the Church of England. He preferred the word communicant to member. He did not know the proportion of schools which were managed under the modern trust deed.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I believe, from information which I have at hand, that a great majority of the schools are under the modern trust deed.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he did not know whether the word used was member or communicant, but that did not get rid of the difficulty. The noble Lord's view was that the education of the country ought to be in the hands of the clericals.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I said that religious education in the Church schools should be under the clergy.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said the point was that the noble Lord was driven to the position that nobody should take part in the management of the Church schools but the clergy. He was in a hopeless minority in the country and he was in a hopeless minority in this House if hon. Members were able freely to express their convictions. What was wanted in order to check the practices which had grown up in various parts of the country was that the laity should be represented. The speech of the First Lord of the Treasury seemed rather sympathetic, but what security had they that the lay element would be allowed to come in? Surely it was reasonable to ask that the parents should have a voice in saying who were to be the managers of a school. The body of the pious founder would turn in his grave if he knew of some of the things which were now practised. In 999 cases out of 1,000 the clergyman would be one of the foundation managers, but he ought not to be the sole controlling manager. It was necessary that they should know precisely how the number of managers was to be fixed. The First Lord of the Treasury had stated earlier in the evening that the number of managers was not necessarily confined to six, and the right hon. Member for East Somerset had equally clearly said that the number was confined to six. It was important that the Committee should know whether the answer given by the Prime Minister was the right one. The hon. Member quoted sub-Head (*b*) of Clause 7, and, in view of the Prime Minister's statement in regard to the number of managers not being limited to six, asked what interpretation was to be put on it.

MR. MALCOLM hoped the Government were satisfied with the new position they had taken up with regard to trust deeds. That position he held to be that they had altered trust deeds and watered them down to suit the purposes of the Bill. The right hon. Member for South Aberdeen had made a remark which passed without any protest from the Government, namely, when he expressed indignation at the idea that trust deeds might overrule the wants and wishes of living men. He should like to know how far this new theory as to the violation of the sanctity of trust deeds was going to be carried. Was it to stop at endowed schools, or would it be extended to other forms of property? If it was not going to be extended, he thought it very invidious to alter trust deeds only in the case of voluntary and endowed schools; but if it was going to be extended, it would be very dangerous, in the future, to institutions which, at least, Conservatives had been proud to defend.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said the speeches of the noble Lord and other hon. Members had proved that the defenders of trust deeds were rather to be found on the Opposition side of the House than on the other. The spirit of the old trust deeds was largely in favour of a fair representation of the laity, which was what they asked for. He did not intend to deal with any of the arguments which had been so admirably and conclusively stated in regard to the main issue, but he wished to refer to the central point of interest in regard to this Amendment. The First Lord had given his own view and justification of what the Bill was going to do, and the Attorney General had given information as to what could be done under the Bill. What he wanted to say was that the Clause they were discussing did not create any machinery for carrying out the objects pointed out by the First Lord, or the suggestions made by the Attorney General. The First Lord had said in the most unqualified way that he did not wish to see this power of constituting any board of managers solely or mainly of clerical elements continued, but this Bill provided no machinery for checking that which, in the First Lord's opinion as well as in his own, was an evil. He had taken the trouble to examine some of the facts in his own division. In one of the towns there were three churches, and the clergy had created great animosity owing to their Ritualistic practices. In one of these churches there were three curates. In another town, the principal Church had no less than five curates; and he challenged the Government to deny that the Clause, as it now stood on the Paper, would make it possible for the incumbent, if not imperative, to place these curates on boards of management. It was really idle to say that the Board of Education had any power to interfere except in relation to the members of the board of managers provided for under Section 7 of the Bill. He was willing to credit the First Lord with perfect sincerity when the right hon. Gentleman said that he did not wish these managerial bodies to be composed entirely of clerics, and when he made the remark, which was of very great interest, that he anticipated that societies like the

National Society would draw up a scheme which would carry out some of the objects he had in view. But what he maintained was that that was not provided for in the Bill or in the Clause under discussion. It would be of interest to have an explanation of the meaning which could be attached to what the First Lord had said as to drawing up a further scheme, either with the consent or under the supervision of the Board of Education, or by a society like the National Society. What they were concerned with was the question of the laity having some right to protect themselves — ordinary humble Churchmen who had quite as good a right to be considered, and not merely Nonconformists and their grievances—from extravagances in religious teaching which a large majority of these Church parents strongly objected to. It was a fact within his own knowledge that many of the Churchpeople in the town he had referred to had been obliged to leave these churches and go to villages two or three miles distant if they wished to attend a communion service such as they had been accustomed in former times to associate with the pure and reformed religion of the Church of England. Under this Bill, as it stood, the clergy who had thus acted would have a perfect right and opportunity to be placed in the full management and control of these schools. That was a gross evil. As to the Amendment, he had great doubt as to using the parent as an elector as a practical remedy. On the management there should be a representation of the Church spirit, and not merely of the clerical spirit. This was not a Party question, and he trusted hon. Gentlemen opposite, many of whom he knew shared the views he had been expressing, would support an effort to obtain some modification of the Bill by which the great evils possible under this Clause should not be allowed to occur.

*Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he rose with considerable hesitation to intervene in this debate; first, because his short acquaintance with the House of Commons would, he thought, cause him to transgress some of its Rules before he sat down; and, secondly, because he came in, unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, at the fag-end of a lengthy and much debated Bill, and at the end of the session, when everything that could be said upon the Bill, *pro* or *con*, had already been said, and he took it that the audience there were satiated with arguments for and against that measure. But he was encouraged to speak on this occasion because the issue that had been raised during the course of the discussion had been rather wider than he anticipated from the terms of the Amendment put down by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs. He would like, before touching on some of the controversial points raised, to thank the hon. Member opposite—he did not know where he sat for and he had now left the House—who was kind enough to make a statement in regard to his election to the effect that it was a victory for the principles of some League which he was understood to represent there. He had always understood that amongst hon. Members opposite that election was understood to have been fought upon the Education Bill, and that the reduction of the majority was, in a certain sense, a check to His Majesty's Government upon that Bill. He was sure it must be a very reassuring matter to hon. Members on that side of the House to learn that the Education Bill, as indeed was the fact, had nothing whatever to do with the election, and that, if there was a triumph in that election for the principles of the League which he represented, it was also in that sense a triumph for His Majesty's Government. The Amendment which had been suggested by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs raised certainly a very grave question, as had been shown during the course of that debate, and the hon. Member who spoke last, in a certain sense, raised the particular issue, which was whether one-man control in the conduct of those schools had been sufficiently checked by this Bill. When this Bill was first introduced and when it appeared in all its nakedness before the country, he thought there was a general disposition amongst all classes of the community to consider that it stood very much in need of Amendment. It had received that Amendment during its passage through the House of Commons, and, for his part, he thought that those Amendments had been due as much to the spirit and temper of His Majesty's Ministers in the conduct of the measure as they had been in any sense due to the suggestions from the other side of the House. The question raised was whether what was called one-man management had been sufficiently checked by what had been already adopted in way of Amendment to the Bill. He thought they had gone a pretty long way in checking one-man management under the Bill. In the first place, as was pointed out by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, they had the control over the secular education, then they had the two members of the management committee appointed entirely by local bodies ; last of all, they had something which did not appeal to the noble Lord, but did appeal to him very strongly and to many others—the Amendment which stood on record as the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. He extremely regretted that that Amendment should have had the effect it had apparently had upon the noble Lord, who fell into an unduly pessimistic frame of mind, when he appeared to contemplate, not only the decease of His Majesty's Government, but possibly also the decease of his near relative. If that Amendment had had so serious an effect in that direction he could only hope the House would be reassured by what he could truly state to be the fact—that in his election, at any rate, the effect of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was of the most gratifying nature. If he came with any mandate to that House—he did not know that he did, and he certainly did not receive any—he took it to be that so far as the principles laid down in the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment were concerned, he was sent there to defend and support them in what the noble Lord was pleased to call all their naked deformity, without dilution or mitigation—and both by vote and speech to carry them, so far as he could, in the support of His Majesty's Government. There were even wider issues raised upon that question of Church reform and Church policy. The noble Lord had alluded to the difficulty of saying who was and who was not a Member of the Church of England. He thought they were all agreed that there was a difficulty, not only as regarded the membership of the Church of England, but even sometimes a slight obscurity as to what were the principles of the Church of England. He would hope it would be recognised that the Government, in dealing with the great question of settling the management of those schools, had an enormously difficult task to contend with. Although the word "bargain" was occasionally repudiated on both sides of the House, as a matter of fact the whole basis of that Bill was nothing more nor less than a bargain, concordat, or whatever they liked to call it, between the State and the Churches concerned. He saw no reason why they should be ashamed of admitting that it was. He saw no reason why, as Churchmen, they should be ashamed of admitting that there was under that Bill, in a certain sense, to be a new concordat between the State and the Churches on the subject of the religious education of the young. There was no doubt whatever that what had been done in regard to the religious instruction of the young was something different from what it was to be under that Bill, and the change was simply in favour of giving the laity more control over the education in the future, and diminishing the control which had hitherto been exclusively exercised by the clergy. Turning to the terms of the Amendment, he must confess he would at an earlier stage of that measure have been very glad if the Church, of which he was a member, had seen its way, in the single-school rural areas at any rate, to accept some representation from the parents of the children. He could not share the difficulties, rather he thought of a metaphysical character, which distressed the noble Lord the hon. Member for Greenwich in regard to the rights and duties of the parents. He might have misunderstood him, but he took him to say that although a parent had a right to have his child educated in the full principles of his own religious faith—at, he supposed, the public expense—he had no right to express what his wishes or ideas were in regard to that faith in the only effective manner which, under present-day conditions, he could—by his vote for a representative on the board of management. That seemed to him a hard saying. He did not wish to enter into metaphysical arguments, but he would have thought under modern conditions that it was possible even for a parent to express his ideas by his vote in regard to the education of his child. But they had to recollect that what was suggested by the Amendment went a good deal farther than anything that had happened hitherto in regard to the Bill, even than that awful Amendment, the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. What was suggested was that that House, without consultation with the Church as far as he knew, without getting an expression of opinion from representative bodies of the Church, should proceed to form a religious constituency which was to send on to those boards of management representatives according to the denominational views of that body. He regarded that as a very extreme step to take. He spoke with very great hesitation in those matters, because he was quite unacquainted with the length to which that House was prepared to go. Certainly, on such questions as the reform and discipline of the Church of England—a matter in which for his sins he had had some little experience, thorny as they were—he did not know how far the House was prepared to go, but he was certain of this, that it was not open to the House to force upon any religious body, whether it were the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Church, or any other, a system practically of religious constituencies and self-government, without at any rate the appearance of some form of consultation in the matter. Therefore, surely, while some of them on that side of the House might retain the honest opinion that the Church of which they were staunch members would have been better advised had it accepted, in the rural areas at any rate, some representation directly from the parents—at the same time they were not prepared, *vi et armis*, to force upon the Church, by their vote in this House, what she herself had not expressed her willingness to accept. He wished she could have seen her way to accept it, because he believed, in spite of all the trust deeds, and in spite of the dead hand with which they had to deal, they would be safer in matters affecting the Church of England if, instead of reverting to the past, they had dealt with the immediate and practical problem of the moment; and surely in admitting, as that Amendment suggested, the parents of Nonconformists to a vote for the purpose of sending a representative on to the management bodies of those schools, they might in that sense have welcomed it as tending to broaden the position of the Church of England, to enlist in her cause the sympathies of those numberless Nonconformists who, after all, he believed were not so far alienated from her as some people imagined, and by giving them a direct interest in the religious instruction of their own children to bring them to the conviction that the National Church was not inimical to their claims, but might, in due time and with proper diplomacy in Church and State, come to be once more the National Church of this country.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) complimented the hon. Member who had just spoken upon the most admirable debating speech to which they had listened from a new Member of the House. The hon. Member was not privileged to be in the House during the First and Second Reading debates in the earlier stages of this Bill, and before he came to deal with the Amendment the hon. Member gave them a general view of the measure. He should not be allowed to follow the hon. Member in that respect, but he congratulated him upon a most interesting speech. It was specially interesting to those who sat on the Opposition side of the House, because the hon. Member, coming fresh from his constituency, absolutely confirmed everything that had been said upon that side of the House as to the origin of the Bill. The Government had repudiated over and over again the statement that there was any concordat or agreement with the Church, but the hon. Member for East Toxteth twice most explicitly stated that the Bill was the result of a concordat between the Government and the Church. And when he came to deal with the Amendment before the Committee the hon. Member expressed his full sympathy with that Amendment, and gave as his only grounds for not supporting it that it was not part of that concordat. Might he suggest to the hon. Member that the Church had a special representation in the Parliament of the realm, through the bishops in the House of Lords, and that they were perhaps incidentally represented in this House by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich and other representatives of the ecclesiastical party. The hon. Member might therefore safely vote on that occasion for the Amendment of which he approved, and see what view the special representatives of the Church—the bishops in the House of Lords—would take of the matter when it came before them in the House of Lords incorporated in this Bill. The hon. Member had gone out of his way to describe his election as a triumph, but he only claimed it as a triumph of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, and his support of the Bill, and even his rejection, on grounds of expediency, of the Amendment now before the Committee, appeared to be based, like his election, on the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. With regard to the Amendment itself, there might be some on the Government side of the Committee who might be disposed to think the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs had been too specific in the form of his Amendment. A distinguished artist who had written a book on the gentle art of making enemies, had said, while any man could choose his friends, no one could be too particular in choosing his enemies. It might be felt by those who opposed the Amendment that his hon. friend had been too particular. Therefore it was important to understand that, if the Amendment were accepted in principle, the mover would, as he understood, be willing that the other side should amend it as regarded the particular form of constituent body to be adopted. The Amendment had assumed fresh importance since the Attorney General had made an explanation which, for the purposes of the trust deed, anticipated the inclusion of subscribers to a national fund if resident in the district, and it was not clear what "district" meant, because there was nothing in the trust deeds about "resident in the parish," and frequently voluntary subscribers did not reside in the parish at all, but in an adjoining parish, and the moment it was extended in that way to a district fund or a national fund for repairing national schools, it would enormously widen it. The whole scope of the debate had been enormously widened by the admissions of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS pressed for an answer to his question of whether the number of managers was to be limited to six, or whether it was to be an unlimited number, as stated by the Attorney General.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON'S reply did not reach the Press gallery.

(6.43.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 218. (Division List No. 555.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Newnes, Sir George

Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Reid,Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York,W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. George Whiteley.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHn GeraldW.(Leeds
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles,Capt. H. F.(Middlesex
Bowles,T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Coddington, Sir William
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, SirWilliam Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt.Hon.Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H.(CityofLond.
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene,Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(M'dd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch,ErnestFrederickGeorge
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jeffreys,Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, CaptainHerbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon,Hn.GeorgeT.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hon.Walter(Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Milner, Rt.Hn.SirFrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,M.H.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,H.C(North'mbTyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer,Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheff'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES
Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(6.55.) MR. ALFRED HUTTON said the Amendment he now proposed to move was not quite accurate as it stood on the Paper. He moved to insert, after the word "managers" in the first line, the words "of whom one shall be the parent of a child attending the school." That, he submitted, would leave the appointment in the hands of the persons who had the appointment under the trust deed, but it would compel them to appoint a parent of a child attending the school. The Amendment was one that should have the sympathy of the Committee. Hon. Members opposite had used the parents as a cover under which they had urged the importance of having dogmatic teaching in the schools. So far the parent had been made the stalking-horse to obtain other concessions, and it was not asking much to ask that hon. Members should show some slight practical confidence in the parents by supporting an Amendment which provided that there should be among the managers one layman who was the parent of a child attending the school. If the Government were going to reject every suggestion of this kind, they would simply ensure the power of nomination being left in the hands of the clergyman. They had declined to give the nomination to the laity on the ground that the laity could not be defined, or to the parents on the ground that they had rights only over their own children, so that the nomination remained in the hands of the incumbent. The] Clause for the grouping of schools had been inserted with a view to improving the administration from economic and educational point of view. But if schools over a considerable area were to be grouped, each of those schools would have a right to one representative on the body of managers, and the incumbent of each parish might reasonably claim to sit on the board by which his own school was managed. There was every probability of that happening, and he thought there ought to be some stipulation that other than clerical representatives should have a right to sit on these boards of management.

Amendment proposed,

"In line 1, after the word 'managers,' to insert the words 'of whom one shall be the parent of a child attending the school.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had always had a certain amount of sympathy with those who wished to see the parents of the children represented on the board of management. But manifestly the proper time to have made such a provision was when dealing with the other two managers. It would only hamper the election of trustees if this limitation were imposed.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) pointed out that the endowments of voluntary schools had been greatly increased, inasmuch as in future they were to have the rents of the schoolmasters' houses, a share of the fees, and a large proportion of the endowments, and all the supporters of this Amendment asked in return was a slight increase of popular management. That was surely a very small request. It should be remembered that the model trust deed provided that the clergyman in any case should be chairman of the body of trustees, and there was nothing in the Bill which prevented the continuance of that provision. Therefore, even assuming the parent turned against the clergyman, the latter would still have a casting vote. The Government might very well go to this small extent in enlisting popular sympathy with the schools. The success of the elementary schools in America was due to the popular sympathy they had been able to enlist by giving the public the share of representation to which they were entitled. Under this Bill the public were not given their due share of representation, and, in view of the concessions made to voluntary schools, the least the Government could do was to accept this Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said there was a further reason why the parent representation should be taken out of the denominational managers under the trust deed. The hypothesis on which the Bill had been defended was that the large majority of the parents were members of the denomination to which the school belonged and desired denominational instruction; therefore, it was among those parents that the managers should be sought. As the parent was the person supposed to desire denominational instruction, he was the proper man to voice as a manager the wish of the other parents. The reason the proposal to take a parent out of the popular managers was not warmly accepted on that side was that they desired the popular managers to be chosen with the greatest possible freedom—that the field of selection should not be in the least degree limited.

SIR JOHN GORST said that the right hon. Gentleman had spoken as if the foundation managers were to be chosen from time to time. That was not the scheme at all. The scheme was that foundation managers were to be the trustees under the deed, or under variations ofthe deed made by order of the Board of Education. Suppose that a parent was appointed one of the foundation managers, what would happen when the parent so appointed ceased to be the parent of a child in the school? The child would grow up and cease to be a scholar. How was a new trustee to be appointed, and what was to become of the old trustee? The Amendment was really unworkable, and was based on a misapprehension as to the manner in which the foundation managers were to be appointed.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said that unless on the board of management there were persons connected with the children under instruction the board might be entirely out of touch of everything that went on in the schools. The members might be all bachelors, or they might be old fossils of seventy or eighty years of age who had been managers for half a century, and were really incapable of properly discharging their duties. It was very desirable in such cases that there should be some change. The Prime Minister objected to the Amendment at the present stage. If the right hon. Gentleman would undertake to have it inserted elsewhere, no doubt his hon. friend would withdraw it now, but it ought certainly to be embodied in some portion of the Bill.

MR. WHITLEY could find no suggestion in the Bill that the foundation managers were to be appointed for the term of their natural lives. This proposal to put one parent on the board of management was the suggestion of the Government themselves in one of the forms of Clause 7. It was not the fault of the Opposition that the proposal had been dropped, and they were now taking their last opportunity of asking the Government to carry out the principle. Surely it was reasonable that the parents should add one to the denominational managers. There was no fear of them choosing from any other denomination, and they could not rest assured that this representative would be a Churchman, or a member of the same denomination as the school. He was simply asking that the parents should not be overlooked and neglected in this matter. For his part he thought that if the Government refused this Amendment it would be a very thorough exposure of the hollowness of their professions with regard to their desire that the teaching should be according to the wishes of the parents of the children.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) expressed the opinion that if the Government were to accept the Amendment the popularity of the Bill would be increased, because it would give parents some voice in the management of the schools. It was true they would have a voice in the election of County Councils, by whom the Education Bill was to be administered, but working men were unable in most cases to become members of the County Councils, and it was therefore most important that every reasonable opportunity should be afforded them for taking part in the administration of the schools. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had said while a man might have jurisdiction over his own children, that did not carry power over other men's children. But he ventured to say that only the man who had children himself was really qualified to enter into the difficulties and necessities of other men's children attending schools. Consequently he considered it would be highly desirable for the Government to accept the Amendment. He did not agree that there would be no necessity for voluntary subscriptions under the Bill, but the area for which those subscriptions would be collected would be considerably curtailed. The working classes would be unable to give the qualifying subscription necessary under the trust deed, and would, therefore, be shut out from the boards of management. If the Amendment were accepted it would obviate that difficulty and tend to increase public confidence in these schools. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had suggested that a manager elected as a parent would cease to be a manager when his child left school, but that difficulty could be surmounted by giving the other managers a power to fill up vacancies, and they could elect the parent of another child attending the same school. This would ensure a continuation of parental representation and would have the additional advantage of ensuring the introduction of new blood occasionally amongst the foundation managers. As one who had loyally supported the main principles of the Bill, he urged upon the Government the importance of accepting the principle of the Amendment, being certain it would tend to the advantage of the voluntary schools and the welfare of the children.

(7.19.) Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 97; Noes, 210. (Division List, No. 556.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George

Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Willox, Sir John Archibald

Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Alfred Hutton and Mr. Samuel Evans.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dix'n
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest

Gibbs, Hn. H. A. G (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hon W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edward M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne

Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Managers):—

(9.0.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he wished to move to insert after the word "appointed" in line 1, the words "for a term of three years." The object of the Amendment was perfectly clear. He did not want the foundation managers to be a sort of life governors of a school maintained out of public money. He did not think that that would be desirable. He should like to know whether there was any term of office for the managers of provided schools, or whether they also would be permanent. He took it that it would be a case of once a manager of a voluntary school always a manager. He therefore moved to insert "a term of three years;" but there would be nothing to prevent managers being re-appointed. It was a very invidious thing to remove a man from office, and it was never done unless the case were a very gross one. It involved so much personal unpleasantness, more especially among members of the same Church, that a manager would not be removed unless the state of things was so bad as to amount to a public scandal. He did not think that a clergyman, who would practically dominate the school, should be called upon to dismiss one of the managers, and create unpleasantness in his own Church. What he suggested was that each manager should hold office for three years. That would apply to a case of this kind. If the Government insisted that the subscribers were to be the constituency, it might be that, in one year, there would only be half a dozen subscribers, as there might be no call for money; but if, a few years later, £100 was wanted to make an addition to the school, then there would be a new set of subscribers, who would not have any representation at all. His final reason was that they were trying a new experiment, and, like every other experiment, it depended far more for its success on the men who worked it than on the theoretical perfection or imperfection of the Bill itself Even if a Bill were a thoroughly bad Bill, first class men might rescue it from utter abject failure; therefore, the class of men who would work the Bill was a very important consideration. If those men were appointed permanently they could not be changed, and the result might be disastrous. He thought the Government would be well advised to insert some limitation, such as he proposed.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, after the word 'appointed,' to insert the words 'for a term of three years.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said they had had a similar discussion before in the case of the education committees of the local education authorities. The Committee then discussed the question whether it was desirable to limit, by statute, the duration of office of members of those committees, and came to the conclusion, which he thought a wise one, that it was not desirable to fix by statute their period of office, but to leave it to the local education authority to act according to its own notions as to what would be most convenient, having regard to the circumstances in each case. The Committee having decided in that way with reference to more important bodies, he could not help thinking that it would be unwise, and, at any rate, that it would be very undesirable, that they should limit the term of office of smaller bodies. It was not suggested that a limit should be put to the term of office of managers appointed by the local education authority for provided schools, or of representatives of the local education authority on the management of non-provided schools; and, under the circumstances, it would surely be going into unnecessary detail to introduce such incongruous matter into the Bill now. The matter would come up in due course, because the trustees in making their application to the Board of Education would suggest a term of office, and the Board of Education would, no doubt, accept that suggestion. There was no reason for departing from the practice which the Committee had adopted in the case of the education committees, and fixing by statute a term of office for foundation managers.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) said that, personally, he saw no reason why there should not be a change in the managership from time to time; but to fix three years, seemed to him to be a most impracticable proposal. It was quite possible that, in certain circumstances, some schools would benefit by a periodical change of managership; but he did not believe that there would be any difficulty in making such an arrangement. On the other hand, it might be difficult to replace a certain set of managers by another set. He did not see why a state of things which was working well should be interfered with. The Amendment was an ideal rather than a real proposal; and he thought it would be better if the Committee confined itself to Amendments which were really practicable.

(9.13.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 60; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 557.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Bell, Richard
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Samuel Evans.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) said he wished to move an Amendment to insert after the word "deed" the words "existing on the 1st day of January, 1902." He would not have moved the Amendment if there had been a chance of getting a larger lay element on the management of the schools, but his object was to meet a state of circumstances and exigencies which might arise under the Bill, possibly resulting in the turning of undenominational schools into denominational schools. Transfers of that kind had taken place in the past, and, in his opinion, they were most improper transfers. For example, in the beginning of the last century schools were often built on land granted by Inclosure Commissioners, the "clergyman, churchwardens, constables, and overseers," as the words then ran in the grant, for the erection of schoolhouses which were to be appropriated for ever afterwards for the benefit of the schoolmaster for the time being. In those schools there were no denominational trusts, and yet because the officers were Churchmen, as, indeed, they were bound to be by law, in many cases those schools had, in the course of time, become denominational. There was one very striking example in Yorkshire in 1816. An allotment was awarded out of common land for an undenominational day and Sunday school under the trustees. In 1850 only one trustee was left, and that was the clergyman; he turned the school into a denominational school, and made it a condition that the superior teacher should be a communicant of the Church of England. Not content with that, the clergyman, by the aid of the Charity Commissioners, turned three other schools into denominational schools. Not only had that been done in the past, but he believed they ran a considerable chance of it being done in the future. On November 13th, Archdeacon Wilson writing for *The Times*, said—

> "If, as will be necessarily the case, new trust deeds are almost universally adopted for the transfer of these schools, provision may be made that in all Church of England schools the teaching should be in accordance with the principles of the Established Church, and that the removal of all foundation managers shall rest with the Bishop of the diocese."

While the Secretary to the National Society, Canon Brownrigg, wrote, saying—

> "I shall be much obliged if you will allow me to make known that the National Society have prepared a form of deed under which private owners of school buildings can let such buildings under an annual or longer tenancy to persons who will be in the position of trust managers under an Act of Parliament. We have also a form of conveyance for such owners who wish to put the buildings definitely in trust."

It seemed to him that this was a matter with which the House ought to deal. It came to him as a revelation. As he understood it, schemes would have to be provided by the existing trustees of the school, but, in his opinion, they ought not to have schemes of that kind. It was a question with which Parliament ought to deal here and now. This Act would do very many extraordinary things, but it ought not to set up the Board of Education as a sort of independent legislative body to deal with such things. It was a serious matter which certainly concerned the House, which the House itself ought to deal with, and he sincerely trusted they would pass the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'deed,' to insert the words 'existing on the 1st day of January, 1902.'"—(*Mr. Charles Allen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the hon. Member stated that the Bill would do many extraordinary things. There was one thing it would do, and that was to put the education of the country on a thoroughly satisfactory footing. As regarded the Amendment itself, he hoped the Committee would not think of accepting it. The hon. Member told the Committee some anecdotes about some things that had happened in Yorkshire. He did not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman into his Yorkshire cases; because he did not know enough of them to form an opinion as to the justice of the judgment which the hon. Gentleman had pronounced upon them. The hon. Member proposed that no deed made after 1st January, 1902, should have effect; but, if these trust deeds were lawfully made, why should not effect be given to them?

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said he was somewhat surprised at the tone of the Attorney General. He did not think that a Scottish gentleman was the best man to appreciate an anecdote. He thought the hon. Gentleman's opinion on his hon. friend's anecdote was as valuable as his opinion on the Bill. The object of the Amendment was clear, it was designed to avoid fraudulent and sharp practices. *The Times*, which he believed was a very respectable newspaper, published a letter from a real live canon, who advised members of the Church of England to prepare agreements, which would not otherwise have been prepared, in order that the Act might be availed of by members of the Church of England. If the Government were really in earnest in this matter, why in the world should they not adopt the Amendment? If there was a *bonâ fide* trust deed made after 1st January, 1902, he was prepared to admit its validity, but if a trust deed were made in order to get benefits under this Act, which the school otherwise would not receive, then a good case was made out for the Amendment.

(9.30.) MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.) said that, as a Manchester man, he desired to resent in the warmest manner possible the coupling of Archdeacon Wilson's name with fraudulent and sharp practices.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH wished to assure the hon. Gentleman opposite that he did not couple the name of Archdeacon Wilson with this in any way.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that nobody coupled the name of Archdeacon Wilson with any practices of this kind. He would remind hon. Members opposite that the words "sharp practice" were used by Canon Henson in regard to the Bishop of London. When they used the words "sharp practice" these were not their words at all.

*MR. MALCOLM: That statement must be contradicted at once. Canon Henson, in a second letter to *The Times*, specifically denied that his remarks referred to the Bishop of London.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that the words "sharp practice" were used in Canon Henson's letter to *The Times*, and Canon Henson was discussing the action of the Bishop of London, and if it was not the Bishop of London he was referring to, then he should like to know from the hon. Member for Stowmarket of whom Canon Henson was speaking. The Attorney General had called certain facts which had been brought to his notice "anecdotes." That was an extraordinary thing to say, because his learned friend gave chapter and verse for the facts. He had referred to a dictionary for the meaning of the word anecdote and he found the following definition—

> "In its original sense, secret history, or facts not generally known; but in more common usage, a particular or detached incident or fact of an interesting nature."

It might have added "facts generally known, but not known to the Attorney General." The facts brought before the Committee by his hon. friend were, in his opinion, of a really interesting nature, and afforded ample justification for his Amendment. The supporters of the Amendment desired to increase the number of cases where the education authority, and not the clerical party, would be able to dictate who should be the managers of the schools. He read that afternoon in an organ which supported the Government some comments which showed that the Amendment of his hon friend was absolutely necessary. The organ said this—

> "To-day Mr. Balfour's new Clause relating to managers will be the subject of discussion. This Clause is framed to meet an immediate difficulty that might arise in the application of Clause 7. There are a certain number of voluntary schools, mainly Church schools, which have been built by private benefactors. Such schools frequently have no trust deeds, and so the provisions of Clause 7, with regard to the appointment of the four denominational managers, would not be possible. Mr. Balfour's new Clause provides that under these circumstances, when the trust deed is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act, or insufficient, the Board of Education shall make an order. It is not likely that this Clause will meet with any convinced or cogent opposition, as it is obviously necessary to cover the few cases for which it has been framed. We say 'few cases,' as, although there are a considerable number of schools without trust deeds, it is likely that most of such schools will avail themselves of the arrangement by which the National Society has offered to put schools in trust; and it is quite possible that the Prime Minister anticipates such action on the part of the present owners of these schools. It will be remembered that the Bishop of London was urgent on his hearers to obtain trust deeds, as similar as possible to the old ones, for schools that are now unprovided; and Mr. Evans's Amendment, which would have rendered such action impossible, was rejected by Mr. Balfour."

He thought nothing could be more cogent than the speech of his hon. friend. What was proposed was really very much like the case of a man who was defending a lawsuit, and who in order to provide for what might happen if he lost put the whole of his property in the name of his cousin. That was what the National Society was inviting these people to do, and the National Society was being backed up by high episcopal authority. Were they on this side not really asking the Committee to take not only the proper but the dignified course in this matter? They were legislating in view of the facts as they were at present, and what these good people were suggesting was that in order to obviate the effect of that legislation, the owners of these schools should set their house in order and create new trust deeds where they did not exist at present.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that it was impossible to deal with existing trusts except through the agency of the Charity Commissioners or through the action which was proposed under this new Clause. With regard to the other trusts in connection with which Canon Henson's name had been mentioned he said the suggestion was that new trust deeds should be created in those cases where persons, in virtue of their own property, were the absolute owners of a school. In those cases, it was right, or might be right, that they should put into public hands that which had hitherto been in their own private hands. They were, in that way, divesting themselves of their own property for the good of the community. The suggestion of hon. Members opposite was that private owners should be deprived of the right which they now possessed of putting their private ownership into public hands in such direction as they might choose. He hoped the Committee would not be induced to take such a step.

(9.43) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 73; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 558.)

AYES.

Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Paulton, James Mellor
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Charles Allen and Mr. Ellis Griffith.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brymer, William Ernest
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)

Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said that he wished to propose the Amendment standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Lincoln on behalf of that hon. Gentleman, but with a slight alteration. The Amendment provided that the managers should be men resident in, or who had an interest in, the parish within the school area. He knew of cases where the managers of schools had absolutely no interest in the district, but who lived ten or twelve miles out of the town where the schools were. The Committee would see that a new form of the original Amendment was necessary. He did not think he was asking the First Lord too much, in asking him, to adopt the principle that a man qualified to be a foundation manager should have some direct interest in the school in that area, either by residence, or by being on the register of voters—Parliamentary or County, or Borough Council. That was a safeguard which many, as well on the Government side as on that side of the House, were anxious to see adopted. If the Government accepted the Amendment they would be leaving out of the management no man at all who had any interest in the good conduct of the school, and in the interests of the ratepayers in that part of the county. This was a Conservative Amendment, and in the interest of denominational schools and education. It would prevent packing the management with a particular sect not belonging to the district.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after 'school,' insert 'and shall be either residents in or on the register of voters (Parliamentary or County or Borough Council) for a parish within the school area.'" (*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought this Amendment was quite an unnecessary one. If the hon. Gentleman would look at the model trust deed so often made the text of recent discussions he would see that practically residence, or a qualification similar to that mentioned, was required in the trust deeds of the National Society. What did that show? To him it showed that the interest in the denominational schools was what they expected it to be. At any rate, if the foundation managers were not resident in the parish, or had no local interest, it was very unlikely there would be any inducement to them to take part in the deliberations of the managers, and they being absentees, and the foundation managers being out-voted, the management of the school would fall into the hands of those not elected to carry out denominational arrangements. They ought not to lay down a hard and fast limitation which might exclude a person resident just outside the technical boundary of the area, who had a great interest in education, and therefore be specially fitted, and would be perfectly ready, to give his services to the cause of education.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said that he had an Amendment lower down on the Paper somewhat of the nature of that proposed by the hon. Gentleman. He had put it there because a clergyman might get at loggerheads with his parishioners and go outside the area, obtain a few subscribers, and bring a proselytising society into the parish. That was not a possibility; it had actually happened. It was obvious that they ought not to have outsiders brought into the parish to inflict on the parishioners views on education of which they conscientiously disapproved.

***Sir JOHN BRUNNER** (Cheshire, Northwich) said he wanted to ask his hon. friend who moved the Amendment why he left out the original words in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Lincoln?

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: Because the Chairman would have ruled them out of order.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I was not invited to do so, but I will do so now if desired.

*SIR JOHN BRUNNER said he was extremely sorry that the Chairman's remark had prevented him from addressing some interesting remarks to the Committee.

Question put and negatived.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said he hoped that he need hardly make any apology in moving the next Amendment, because both in and out of the House it had been stated repeatedly, and by none more frequently than by the First Lord himself, that it was intended that the local authority should have absolute supremacy in all matters relating to secular instruction.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Is not this already in the Bill? There is no necessity for repeating it.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said it was not altogether in the Bill. He presumed the Chairman was referring to Section 6, but there were other portions of the Bill to which his Amendment would relate. His object in moving it was to prevent constant disputes and litigations which would arise unless some definite announcement was made. He trusted the Amendment would be accepted by the Government. It could not do any harm, and would define with perfect clearness what was the position of the local authority in regard to secular instruction.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 5, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'Or the absolute control of the local education authority in all matters relating to secular instruction.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. They were providing by the new Clause that—

"If it is shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Education that the provisions of the trust deed as to the appointment of managers are in any respect inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, or insufficient or inapplicable for the purpose, or that there is no such trust deed available, the Board of Education shall make an order under this Section for the purpose of meeting the case."

That was not in any way inconsistent with the absolute control of the local education authority over secular instruction. The two matters had no connection whatever.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said he would not press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he wished to move, as an Amendment, to leave out of line 5, after the word "Act," the words "or insufficient, or inapplicable." He thought these words were unnecessary, although they might have some secret meaning to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the obvious meaning of "insufficient" was to be found in the provisions of Clause 7, which stated that—

"All public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority shall, in place of the existing managers have a body of managers consisting of a number of foundation managers, not exceeding four, appointed as provided by this Act."

And—

"Where the local education authority are the Council of a borough or urban district they may, if they think fit, appoint for any school provided by them such number of managers as they may determine."

He really thought that the meaning of the word "insufficient" was so obvious that it would hardly be complimentary to the intelligence of the House if he were to say another word.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CHANNING moved as an Amendment—

"In line 5, after the word 'insufficient,' insert 'to secure a reasonable representation of the lay members of the denomination.'"

The First Lord had said that he did not consider it desirable that the four denominational managers should be clerical managers, and the effect of the Amendment was to keep that point within the purview of the Board of

Education and to enable the Board to include adequate representation of the laity in their Order.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the answer to the hon. Gentleman had been given in the reply to the mover of the last Amendment. The word "insufficient" was not used in regard to laymen's representation, but of the number of managers. Supposing the trust deed only provided for two managers, it would be unsatisfactory if the Board of Education were unable to raise the number to four, even if one, or both, had to to be clergymen.

*MR. CHANNING begged leave to withdraw his Amendment

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

DR. MACNAMARA said that there was no provision in Clause 8 which provided that the repairs, alterations, and improvements of the school-houses should be made by voluntary contributions, and he wished to move an Amendment by which such provision out of voluntary subscriptions should not be excluded.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is in order.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved to add at the end of the first sub-Section the words: —

> "Provided that in no case shall there be more than one priest, clerk in holy orders, or minister of religion appointed as foundation manager on the committee of management of any school."

He said he would be able to establish the fact that it would be quite possible under this Bill to have four clergymen as the foundation managers, and in such a case the Board of Education would not say the trust deed was insufficient or inapplicable. At the present time there were cases in which the only managers of denominational schools were the ministers of the denomination — indeed, he was not sure that that was not the case in the majority of the schools, and, at any rate, it was clear that a clergyman who was anxious to get complete control of a school could so manipulate the trust deed as to appoint his own colleagues, to the absolute exclusion of the laity. Such a state of things was unsatisfactory. It was not desirable that there should be a largely preponderating clerical voice in the management of these schools. The system he advocated was in existence in Wales; the result had been satisfactory, and no denomination could complain that the power of the education authority in Wales was being used for sectarian purposes. A clergyman would be put on the board of management as a professional expert, not as a citizen, and would naturally take a professional view of most things. In the interests of their Bill, the Government should take steps to prevent the majority of the board of management from being composed of clergymen. The Secretary of the Board of Education would probably tell them he did not believe such a thing would happen. But was it not desirable to put in some safeguard to prevent the possibility of its happening? The natural tendency would be to give a preference to the clergyman when selecting the managers, and he thought the Government would be well advised in introducing some safeguard against the whole of the managers being clerks in holy orders.

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 8, at the end of sub-Section (1), to insert the words, 'Provided that in no case shall there be more than one priest, clerk in holy orders, or minister of religion, appointed as a foundation manager on the committee of management of any school.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*(10.30.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that while throughout these debates he had earnestly desired to maintain the denominational religious teaching of voluntary schools, he had never shown or expressed in any way any desire to perpetuate clerical control. Nevertheless, he was not prepared to accept a clerical disqualification. He was fully prepared to admit that occasions might arise when there might be an unfair preponderance of clergymen on these bodies, but he was also equally certain

that in some sparsely populated districts in rural England it might be very difficult to make up their body of four foundation managers without admitting two clergymen. He was not prepared to accept a professional disqualification (and it was nothing more nor less than that) for places as foundation managers, and on that ground, as well as on the ground of the balance of convenience, which was, he thought, against the hon. Gentleman's proposal, the Government could not accept the Amendment.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said the hon. Baronet had admitted the possibility of an unfair preponderance of the clerical element, but at the same time he objected to the imposition of any disqualification. Might he point out that at the present time the trust deeds imposed a disqualification upon the laity. If that disqualification was imposed on the laity, there should be, not a disqualification but a limitation, on the other side, of the number of clergy upon the governing body of the school. The Government were agreed that it was unfair that boards of managers should be constituted unduly of the clerical element, and he ventured to urge on the Committee that his hon. friend's Amendment pointed to an easy solution of the difficulty.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said there was no doubt some difficulty in finding a satisfactory form of words to limit the clerical element, but he thought the admission of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education that there might be cases of an undue preponderance of the clerical element on these bodies made it incumbent on the Government to provide that such an abuse as that should not occur. It was to be regretted that the Government had not suggested some means whereby they might obtain a majority of laymen on these bodies. In these circumstances, though he admitted that the words of his hon. friend were, in a sense, an undue limitation, he should certainly support the Amendment.

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL said it appeared to him that the lay subscribers might be trusted to take care of themselves. Speaking for the great Northern counties, he was absolutely sure that clerical supremacy was impossible, and he deprecated in the strongest possible manner the imposition of the suggested disqualification. He was very much surprised at some of the observations which had fallen from hon. Members opposite. They appeared to have no confidence in public bodies unless they felt certain themselves to have a majority on them.

Mr. EMMOTT said the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan had stated that those who were on the Opposition side of the House only showed confidence in the people who were of their own opinion. That was an unworthy and unjustifiable charge. The whole object of the discussion on the Bill was that public bodies in this country should be trusted in regard to these matters irrespective of what their political opinions might be. He challenged hon. Members opposite to controvert that statement. This Bill was putting upon public bodies already overburdened further duties. The Secretary to the Board of Education spoke of large localities where the number of members might be increased, but in that case they (the Opposition) would not object to the clerical element being *pro tanto* enlarged. He thought the hon. Baronet and the First Lord of the Treasury had no desire that this should be a clerical control Bill, but the hon. Baronet said the effect of the Amendment would constitute a disqualification of ministers. But he would point out that the Amendments from the Opposition side had been addressed to questions which were calculated to make the Bill work better. They thought there must be on these bodies a preponderance, or, at any rate, a very large lay element. Reference had been made to subscribers, but where were the subscribers going to be under the Bill, and what were they going to subscribe? There was a further matter he had been trying all the evening to find out, who were to be the other foundation managers besides the ministers, and for the life of him he could not make out. They were tearing up practically the great majority of the trust deeds so far as the appointment of managers was concerned, and as they were dealing with the case of grouped schools, it was quite possible on the management of these schools they might have a preponderating clerical element.

That was a thing which should be guarded against, because if it did happen it would be bad for the working of the Bill.

*MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said that, considering the very limited electorate which was evidently going to represent the subscribers, he thought it was desirable, in the interests of public confidence, that some indication should be given as to the constitution of the four denominational managers. His hon. friend said he did not like disqualification. Would it not be less objectionable to state the *minimum* number of lay members to be on the body. Personally, he agreed that it was rather too strict to limit the clerical representation to one. There might be two vicars in adjoining parishes who ought to be on the body.

*MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said his proposal was one clergyman for each school.

*MR. J. W WILSON said he thought it would be more likely to meet the general view, if, instead of limiting the clergymen to two, it was proposed that there should be two laymen on the body. There was nothing to fear from that. One of the two clerical members would have a casting vote; and, he thought, it would tend to establish that confidence which they all desired when the Bill was passed, whatever they might now say or fear—and he hoped the Bill would work smoother than some of them feared—if two laymen were on the board of management. He was not speaking entirely from theory in the matter. He had seen one of the best schools in a large town in his own constituency materially damaged by a trust deed being brought out in an emergency, and the vicar bringing down both his curates to out-vote the remaining member of the committee. The result was that the secretary, who had done most efficient work, and also another member were lost to the school, and the school had scarcely recovered yet. It was an ill-judged thing for the vicar to have done, yet it was possible, and he did it. It was for that reason that he wished to have two lay members on the Committee.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wigan pleaded for a free choice being given. He should not be indisposed to give a free choice as regarded a body elected by anything like a wide constituency; but the elective element for the bodies they were now considering might practically be only one person. It was quite possible that the new trust deeds might be framed in such a way that no one but ministers of religion should be elected managers. The Board of Education would have no power of controlling that at all. They knew how active the clerical element could be; and he thought some such Amendment as that of his hon. friend was very desirable. They did not desire to put any disqualification on ministers of religion at all. All the Amendment proposed was that there should be only one minister of religion out of four. There might be a board on which the vicar and his two churchwardens took the clerical view, the other three members taking the other view, and, in that event, the vicar's presence meant a second vote. It should be remembered that they had already provided for the denominational character of the teaching in the schools; and whether the managers were laymen or clerical men, there would be no question as to their controlling religious teaching. But the infusion of the lay element would be most salutary and necessary, as it was well known that clergymen of all denominations were not the best business men. That was conceded by every one. Having protected denominational teaching in the schools, they ought to consider who were the best people to manage the schools. The Secretary to the Board of Education said that the Amendment would put a disqualification on clergymen; but clergymen were already disqualified from sitting in this House, simply and solely because they were not men of business. However inefficient the House of Commons now was, it would be still more inefficient if a clerical element were introduced into it. He found further, that under an Act of Parliament clergymen were not allowed to farm more than eighty acres, which again showed that they were not good business men. He was not a farmer himself, but he was told that even very good business men could not always make farming pay, and he was quite sure that clergymen could not make it pay. In 1835 the wisdom of their forefathers said that no minister of religion should be allowed to sit on a Town Council, which, of course, meant that they were not fit to manage the affairs of a town. [AN HON. MEMBER: What about County Councils?] Clergymen were admitted to County Councils when the Conservatives came into power; but he thought he had shown that their forefathers considered that the parson was not a fit and proper person for business, although the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich might advance countervailing arguments to show that Parliament had ordained differently. His hon. friend's Amendment was a very fair one, because it dealt with all clergymen alike, and if accepted, it would go to the root of the matter, because it would not only deal with the Anglican Church and the Roman Catholic Church, but with all other ministers of religion. The Amendment dealt with all denominations alike, and its object was to have the management of the schools in the hands of business men.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that he wished to remind the hon. Gentleman that he and his party had objected to the destruction of School Boards; and yet, on School Boards, there were large numbers of ministers of religion. Therefore, the argument about clergymen was double-edged, and could be turned with effect against hon. Gentlemen opposite. He also wished to point out that there might be clergymen who were not connected with any staff or Church in a district, but were owners of property, and proper persons to be on these bodies. They would be excluded under the Amendment.

(11.0.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 88; Noes, 194. (Division List, No. 559.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Samuel Evans.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)

Mr. Samuel Evans.

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hanbury, RtHn. Robt. William
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, RtHn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (W'lthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, RtHn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Sir Gilbert
Parker, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved an Amendment, the object of which was to secure that the local authority should have the same power to apply for an order under the Clause as was given therein to the trustees or managers. He urged that it was of the very first importance that the local authority should have such power. They ought not to have to wait three months to see that the management was on a businesslike footing. What was to happen to the school while the local authority were waiting to see whether the managers or trustees would make an application?

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'the local education authority or.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the only result of allowing these competing schemes——

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, interposing, said there was no question of competing schemes. It was simply a question of an application for a plan.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that in his opinion it was certainly intended that the trustees or managers should be allowed to send up plans for consideration. He did not imagine that the initiative in constructing plans should rest with the Board of Education. There might be—though he hoped not—some little friction in the initiation of the new system, but he did not believe it would be mitigated or shortened by the Amendment. He thought it ought to be left to the trustees of the school to initiate any suggestion as to the form which the new management should take.

MR. BRYCE said he did not see in sub-Section 1 of the Clause any provision directing managers or trustees to send up a scheme, though there was nothing to prevent this being done. If the intention was as the First Lord had suggested, words to that effect ought to be inserted. Under the Clause as it stood there was nothing to give the local authority a *locus standi;* they would not necessarily know what was passing or have an opportunity of interposing if they thought fit. One advantage of the Amendment was that it clearly implied that the local authority might make direct representations to the Board of Education when they found it desirable to do so.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL pointed out that if no applications were made within three months the local authority might move in the matter. The whole object of the Clause was to give the trustees and managers an opportunity of applying, and it was only fair that the privilege should be given them.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said the Act was to come into operation on March 26th next. If the local authority were to wait three months after the passing of the Act before taking any steps, he was afraid it would be very difficult to get the Act into operation by that date. That was a reason for allowing the education authority to approach the Board of Education with a plan. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would at any rate favourably consider an Amendment with the object of facilitating the getting of the Bill into operation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that the existing provision on this subject was that the Act should come into operation on an appointed day. The appointed day was March 26th, 1903, or such other day, not being more than twelve months later, as the Board of Education might appoint, and different days might be appointed for different purposes and different provisions of the Act for different local authorities. There was, therefore, a great deal of elasticity under the arrangement at present proposed. He would remind the hon. Member that, owing to the delay which had taken place in the date at which the Bill would be passed, the Government had proposed as an Amendment a few days ago that the year should be extended to a longer period—eighteen months, he thought—but that, owing to circumstances which the Committee would remember, they did not move that Amendment.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman still considered the advisability of postponing the date at which the Act should come into force, but he hoped March 31, 1903, would not be left in the Bill, as it was an absurdly early date.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY did not read the Clause as providing that schemes or plans should be submitted to the Board of Education; it simply provided that where the trust deeds were faulty, inapplicable, or inconsistent with the provisions of the Act, the Board of Education should make an Order, but, that such Order should be made only on the application of the managers or trustees for a period of three months. The function of the Board was to have regard to the principles on which the education had been carried on in the past, and not to consider any scheme or plan. The local education authority ought certainly to be put on a par with the managers or trustees in the matter.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that the important thing was that, whether the application was made by the trustees or the managers or the education authority, notice should be given to everybody else concerned. As, according to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, these Orders were to be made once for ever, it was only fair that everybody interested who would be bound by the orders should, before the orders were made, have due notice of the application by whomsoever it was made.

Dr. MACNAMARA said the real issue was whether a school should be left for three months without managers. He thought it would not be at all detrimental to the working of the Clause, as no schemes were involved, if the local authority were given the same right of immediate application as was to be conferred on the trustees and managers.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said there was an enormous variety of trust deeds, and a quite unnecessary additional load of work would be thrown on the local education authority if they were given the task of examining the deeds of every voluntary school in their district, with a view of framing a scheme in conformity with those deeds. The local authority would have a great amount of other work to do, and there was no reason they should have thrown upon them additional work, which the trustees or the managers would be well qualified to do, and which the local authority would not be specially qualified to do. There was no premium on delay in this case; the managers would lose, instead of gain, by not finding a scheme; for, until they did so, they would not get a shilling of the rates.

Dr. MACNAMARA: What about the school in the meantime?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the school, in the meantime, would go on as at present. He hoped the Committee would not drag in the local authority to do this work for other people until those other people had shown themselves incompetent to do it.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the right hon. Gentleman had misinterpreted his own Bill, as the rates would be paid to the persons who for the time being were *prima facie* the managers and until some one went to the Board of Education, and showed that they were not the managers. What they wanted was that some one would have the right to approach the Board of Education. It was absurd to suppose that the existing managers should show "to the satisfaction" of the Board that they were not proper managers.

(11.34.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 70; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 560.)

AYES

Allen, Charles P (Glouc. (Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norman, Henry
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)

Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lloyd-George and Dr. Macnamara.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Clause amended by inserting after the word "existing," in line 9, the word "owners."—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said he wished to move an Amendment to add, at the end of line 15, the words "Before such Order is made, reasonable notice thereof, with a copy of the draft Order, shall be given by the Board of Education to the local education authority." Who was to show, to the satisfaction of the Board of Education, that the provisions of the trust deeds as to the appointment of managers were inconsistent with the provisions of the Act? Trustees would not take upon themselves a responsibility of that kind. In reply to the previous Amendment the First Lord of the Treasury said it was not fair to allow this additional burden to be placed upon the shoulders of the local education authority—meaning, of course, the burden of making a new plan. He did not think there would be this difficulty, because the local authorities would have very experienced officers to deal with questions of this kind. In relation to this particular question there could be no burden upon the local education authority. All they wanted was that a draft order should be sent to the local education authority within a reasonable time of its being made. Surely they were entitled, under the circumstances, to see a copy of the plan. Their local knowledge would supplement that of the trustees, and they would be able to show where the plan was incompatible with the general plan of the county. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would make this small concession.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 15, at the end, to insert the words, 'before such Order is made, reasonable notice thereof, with a copy of the draft Order, shall be given by the Board of Education to the local education authority.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE urged the Government to accept this Amendment. It was a reasonable proposal, and it was in accordance with the usual practice that all parties should have notice.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I think the provision made by this Amendment is not an unreasonable one, but at the same time I think that due notice should also be given to any other parties interested.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said he was quite willing to amend his Amendment by adding the words "and to existing owners, trustees, managers, and other persons who may appear to the Board of Education to be interested."

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BRYCE said he desired to have some information in regard to the order of business tomorrow. He wished to know where the new Clauses would come in.

*The CHAIRMAN: I think that tomorrow my duty will be to continue with the Government Clauses, and when they are completed to go on with the Clauses standing in the name of private Members until the hour of eleven o'clock is reached. If before that hour all the new Clauses are disposed of we shall then proceed with the schedules. If at eleven o'clock there still remain some Clauses standing in the name of private Members discussion will cease and the schedules will be taken.

Mr. BRYCE asked the Prime Minister whether in these circumstances he contemplated taking the whole of the schedules under the Closure Rule without any discussion.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS quoted from the Closure Resolution proposed by the Prime Minister, and said that the effect of the present arrangement would be that they might not have an opportunity of discussing the Government Schedules at all.

*The CHAIRMAN: What the hon. Member has just quoted applies to what is to be done before eleven o'clock is reached. At eleven o'clock the particular paragraph which the hon. Member has quoted comes into force.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I had supposed that the discussion would be on Government Clauses and the Schedules, and that only when these were disposed of the Clauses of private Members would have been taken, but, of course, it is not for me to interpret the Rule.

*Mr. CHANNING asked if the First Lord of the Treasury could see his way to meeting the wishes of the House by moving to report Progress at half-past-seven on the Clauses, with a view to putting down the schedules for the evening sitting.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid that is impossible.

Mr. BOND (Nottingham, E.) asked if the new Clauses standing in the name of private Members would be put in the order in which they appeared on the Paper, or would they be taken after the schedules.

*The CHAIRMAN: They will be taken in the order as they appear on the Paper.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) said he had just a word to say upon this Bill. He supported the Second Reading of this measure, but since then he had received reliable intelligence to the effect that the three millions which was voted for the Boers as free grants was being wasted. Money had been given to Boer farmers some weeks ago, and he was informed that they were now actually in a worse condition than they were before. Cattle had been given to them which were diseased, and in consequence many of them had died. He had also been assured by the same authority that nothing had been done to rebuild the many farm-houses which had been burned during the war, and altogether he was told that not only was the money being wasted, but the Boers were being pauperised. He wished to ask whether the Colonial Secretary felt satisfied that the free grant of three millions was being administered for the benefit of the Boers in the best possible way, and he also wanted to know, if the right hon. Gentleman was not satisfied, whether he was going to take any action in the matter.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon): It is impossible to say how the money is being spent now. It is being spent under the superintendence of Lord Milner, and the House may rest assured that the money is being expended in the best possible way for the benefit of the Boer population.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXIV.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Patents Law Amendment	—	Read 2^a 17th Nov. (1099)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Bankers (Ireland) Act Repeal	*Mr. Wyndham*	Second Reading (adjourned) 4th Nov. (127) Read 2^o 5th Nov. (254) Committee 12th Nov. (856)
*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2)	*Mr. Ritchie*	Read 1^o 6th Nov. (349) Read 2^o 10th Nov. (575) Committee Report 12th Nov. (851) Read 3^o and passed 19th Nov. (1468)
*Education (England and Wales)	*Mr. A. J. Balfour*	Committee 4th Nov. (15) (79) Committee 5th Nov. (151) Committee 6th Nov. (277), (349) Committee 7th Nov. (386) Procedure Debate 11th Nov. (607), (676) Committee 12th Nov. (761), (815) Committee 13th Nov. (883), (943) Committee 14th Nov. (1030) Committee 17th Nov. (1144), (1187) Committee 18th Nov. (1243), (1307) Committee 19th Nov. (1367) (1433)
*Electric Lighting Act Amendment (Scotland)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Read 1^o 12th Nov. (760) Read 2^o 18th Nov. (1344)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Expiring Law Continuance	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Committee Report 6th Nov. (379)
*Food and Drug Act Amendment	*Mr. Hanbury*	Bill withdrawn 10th Nov. (584)
Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (London) (No. 2)	*Mr. Herbert Robertson*	Bill withdrawn 18th Nov. (1242)
*Militia and Yeomanry	*Mr. Brodrick*	Second Reading (adjourned) 10th Nov. (578)
*Osborne Estate	*Mr. Ritchie*	Second Reading (adjourned) 10th Nov. (583)
*Supreme Court of Judicature [H.L.]	*Sir. Robt. Finlay*	Read 2° 5th November (252) Committee 6th Nov. (380) Report 7th Nov. (448) Read 3° and passed 14th Nov. (1096)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1902.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[Continuation of List given in preceding Volume.]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts,—Copy of Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1889 [46 and 47 Vic., c. 57, s. 101 (5)]	5 November	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Additional Rule varying the Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1903 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6.]	14 November	40 days
Universities (Scotland) Act, 1899 (Ordinance),—Copy of University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow, No. 2) Regulations for Degrees in Science in Public Health [52 and 53 Vic., c. 55, s. 20.]	18 November	12 weeks

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1902.

NOVEMBER 4—*NOVEMBER* 19.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENTS AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in the Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
  Gaelic Tournament at Rathcormac, Intrusion of the Police, *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Abstract Motions
  Abandonment of Abstract Motions on Tuesday and Friday due to Elaborate Discussion of Supply.
    O. *Lord G. Hamilton, Nov. 10*, 516.

Accidents
  Naval Salutes, Number of Accidents during the last ten years.
    Q. *Nov. 12*, 741.
  Newry Railway Accident—Notification to the Board of Trade.
    Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.
  Thames Ironworks Level Crossing—Fatal Accident to Henry Eade.
    Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Aden Fortress
  Maintenance of — Apportionment of Charges between Indian and Imperial Exchequers.
    Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Nov. 10*, 503; Mr. Moon, 514.

Adjournment of the House
  Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order XVII—Tunbridge Wells Municipal Telephone System, Purchase by National Telephone Co., Mr. Lough's proposed Motion, *Nov. 11*, 603.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
  Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
  Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Afghanistan
  "Ganja" (Preparation of Indian Hemp), Prohibition of Sale by Amir.
    O. Mr. Caine, *Nov. 10*, 536.
  Russia and Afghanistan—Direct Communication from the Russian Government to the Amir, etc., alleged.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 868.

Africa
  French Congo—Concessionnaire Companies' Exclusive Rights of Proprietorship and Trading, Effect on Interests of British Traders—Representations to the French Government.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.
  Morocco—Kabyle Revolt, Steps taken to Protect British Interests.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Africa, East
  British East Africa Protectorate—Land Grants, Conditions.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 871.
  Somaliland, *see* that title.
  Uganda, *see* that title.
  Zanzibar, Case of Slave Girl Msichoke—British Agent's Report.
    Q. *Nov. 11*, 586.

Africa, South
  British Indian Subjects, Disabilities of—Retaliatory Legislation by Indian Administration, proposed.
    O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 554, 555.
  Cape Colony, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Africa, South—*cont.*

Compensation for War Losses—Amount of Compensation due under the Terms of the Hague Convention.
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *Nov. 5*, 249.

Concentration Camps.

Cost of.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 233.

Number of persons still in the Camps.
Os. Sir R. Reid, *Nov. 5*, 212; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 232.

Devastation caused by the War, Extent of.
Os. Sir R. Reid, *Nov. 5*, 212; Mr. Labouchere, 223; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 236.

Expenditure—War Expenditure, Terminal Charges, etc., Date when full Statement by the Government may be expected.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Nov. 10*, 576, 577; Mr. Hayes Fisher, 577.

Horses—Sale of Army Horses suffering from Infectious Diseases, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 590.

Irrigation—A large Scheme of Irrigation and Colonisation the key to the South African Problem.
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *Nov. 5*, 214.

Labour—Plentiful Supply of Labour the one thing needful for South Africa.
O. Sir H. Meysey-Thompson, *Nov. 5*, 222.

Prisoners of War.
Number returned to South Africa, Number still in exile.
Os. Sir R. Reid, *Nov. 5*, 213; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 232.

Prisoners who were British Subjects before Declaration of War, Treatment of.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

Settlement of South Africa.

Farms, Purchase of by Lord Milner—Taking advantage of the present necessities of the Boers to force on Sale of Farms, alleged.
O. Sir R. Reid, *Nov. 5*, 212.

Peace, Probable Cost of.
Os. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 5*, 219, 222; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 236.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony, *see* that title.

Agrarian Outrages, Ireland

Returns Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 10*, 450.

Agriculture

Ireland.

Importation of spurious Basic Slag—Proceedings against Agent, Protection for Farmers etc.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 3.

Maine, State of—Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 449.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland

Irish Language, Instruction in—Regulations preventing Sanction of Expenditure, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

Aird, Stornoway

School Playground—Provision of Shelter for use in severe weather, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1234.

Alien Immigration

Anarchists from Europe settling in London—Legislation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Number of Aliens charged at Metropolitan Police Courts during last year—Expelling Aliens who have made themselves amenable to the Criminal Law, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Royal Commission, No meeting held since July.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 149.

All Hallows Church, Lombard Street

Vacancy — Appointment of Commission under Union of Benefices Act.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 5.

All-Night Sittings

Merits and Demerits of All-Night Sittings as a method of expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 614.

Allan, Sir W. [Gateshead]

Cunard Company, Government Agreement with—Type of Boilers in New Vessels, *Nov. 5*, 132.

"Good Hope," Steaming direct to the Cape, *Nov. 11*, 590.

Navy.

Administration by the Admiralty—Royal Commission proposed, *Nov. 13*, 882, 883.

Boilers.

"Diadem," Repairs, Date of Completion, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1118

"Terrible," Repairs—Laying List upon the Table, *Nov. 17*, 1119.

"Hyacinth," H.M.S. — Defects in Machinery, Experiments with Screws, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1356.

South African Shipping Combine—Notification of Increase of Freight Rates, Powers of the Board of Trade to Intervene, *Nov. 10*, 460.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucester, Stroud]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 841, 842; *Nov. 19*, 1437.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, Transfer of Schools, Opportunity for Discussion, *Nov. 13*, 877.

Alverstone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice*
Indian Finance—Apportionment of Charges between Indian and Imperial Exchequers, Lord Alverstone's Agreement to act as Arbitrator on points of Dispute.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 485.

Amendments
Business of the House, Amendments to Resolution on—Putting the First Amendment in such a form as to reserve other Amendments of which Notice had been given.
Os. Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 604.

American Mission in the Deccan
Industrial Training given to Indian Famine Waifs.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 553.

Anarchists
European Anarchists Settling in London—Legislation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1358.

Ancient Monuments, Ireland
Greenan, Preservation of Ancient Buildings.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1113.
Tara, Hill of, Excavations—Steps taken to preserve Historical Monuments from destruction.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 463.

Andrews, Private
Reservist Pay Arrears.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 591.

Animals
Diseases of Animals, *see* that title.

Anson, Sir W.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education* [Oxford University]
Appropriation Act, Importance of—Payment of Sums voted to the various Services not legal till authorised by the Act, etc.—Sir W. Anson's Opinion.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 87.
Countesthorpe—Mr. Herbert's complaint of Child being expelled from Board School with object of compelling attendance at Church of England School, alleged, *Nov. 13*, 876.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 46, 48, 51, 72; *Nov. 5*, 155, 166, 173, 183, 184, 186, 188, 209; *Nov. 6*, 277, 285, 288, 301, 304, 350, 351, 354, 356, 359, 361; *Nov. 7*, 387, 403, 431; *Nov. 12*, 787, 788, 790; *Nov. 13*, 908; *Nov 14*, 1040, 1055, 1059, 1068; *Nov. 17*, 1202, 1212, 1217, 1218, 1221; *Nov. 18*, 1245, 1246, 1248, 1269, 1278, 1283, 1292, 1293, 1297, 1298, 1301, 1306, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1317, 1324, 1331; *Nov. 19*, 1400, 1434, 1448, 1449, 1450.
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Denominational Schools leased to School Boards, Status of, etc., *Nov. 13*, 877.

Anson, Sir W.—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Evening Elementary Schools, Provision of, *Nov. 19*, 1361.
Provided Schools, *Nov. 17*, 1123.
Welsh Intermediate Education—County Councils' Powers, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1361.
Fees—Number of Schools charging Fees, Amount received, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1124.
Plymtree Schoolroom, Refusal of use for Political Meetings—Withdrawal of Parliamentary Grant, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1236, 1237.
St. John's Church Day Schools, Sutton-on-Plym—Ritualistic Practices at, *Nov. 18*, 1236.
School Buildings—Regulations for Denominational Schools transferred to School Boards to which Building Grants have been made, *Nov. 4*, 10.

Antrim
Census Returns, Delay in issue.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 147.

Applecross, Ross
Road and Bridge, Construction of—Congested Districts Board refusing to provide Grant-in-aid.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 749.

Appropriation Accounts
Expediting delivery to Comptroller and Auditor-General.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1366.

Archdale, Mr. E. M. [Fermanagh, N.]
Army Recruits—Sending more Troops to Enniskillen, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 269.
Foot and Mouth Disease—Estimated loss incurred by Farmers through importation of Cattle from Abroad, *Nov. 6*, 272.
Irish Local Authorities, Contracts—Preference given to Members of the United Irish League, Action of the Government, *Nov. 6*, 275.

Armagh
Census Returns, Delay in issue.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 147.
Income Tax Appeals—Holding Sittings at Armagh instead of Portadown, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 758.

Armour Plate Contracts
Shipbuilding Programme for 1901-02.
Date of placing Orders.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 6.
Issue of Specifications.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 5.

Army
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.
Under-Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.
Financial Secretary—Lord Stanley.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Appropriation Accounts, Expediting delivery to Comptroller and Auditor-General.
Q, Nov. 19, 1366.

Army Corps, 1st and 2nd — Number of Effective Men.
Q. Nov. 13, 864.

Artillery.

Mountain Artillery, Officers receiving lower Pay than Officers of Garrison Artillery.
Q. Nov. 13, 865.

Royal Garrison Artillery—Promotion Grievance.
Q. Nov. 18, 1233.

Canteens—Continuance of Tenant System.
Q. Nov. 18, 1240, 1241.

Cavalry Soldier, Average Annual Cost.
Q. Nov. 7, 385.

Commissions.

Militia Officers enlisting in the Army to serve in South Africa, Granting Commissions proposed.
Q. Nov. 6, 267 ; *Nov. 18*, 1240.

Volunteer Officers Commanding Active Service Companies during the South African War, Granting Commissions proposed.
Qs. Nov. 12, 746 ; *Nov. 19*, 1352.

Contracts for Clothing—Provision in Tenders that work is to be carried out in Factories.
Q. Nov. 18, 1239.

Cost—Average Annual Cost of various Arms.
Q. Nov. 7, 385.

Dragoons, 6th—Sergeant Leonard writing to Secretary of State for War, Degradation to the Ranks.
Q. Nov. 17, 1118.

Entrance Examinations.

Cavalry and Infantry, Placing on an equal footing, proposed.
Q. Nov. 18, 1232.

Syllabus, Uncertainty as to—Inconvenience caused to Public Schools, etc.
Q. Nov. 19, 1355.

Garrison Regiments—Official Reports as to Conduct and Efficiency of.
Q. Nov. 12, 746.

Gratuities to Soldiers on Transfer to Reserve or Discharge—Refusal of Applications.
Q. Nov. 14, 1034.

Hong Kong—Officers, Increase in Lodging and Servant Allowances proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1115.

Horses, *see* that title.

India, *see* that title.

Infantry Soldier of the Line, Average Annual Cost.
Q. Nov. 7, 385.

Army—*cont.*

Interpreters—Pecuniary Advantages to Officers qualifying as Interpreters.
Q. Nov. 6, 264.

Lancers, 9th—Conduct at Sialkote, Indiscriminate punishment of the regiment.
Q. Nov. 17, 1119.

Medals, *see* South African War.

Medical Corps Officers serving in India—Relief Programme, Exclusion of Officers with less than six years' service in India.
Q. Nov. 10, 456.

Militia, *see* that title.

Mobilisation—Government's alleged intention to keep Force mobilised and ready for embarkation.
Q. Nov. 11, 592.

Officers.

Employment of Ex-Officers in the Clerical Department of the War Office, Rules as to.
Q. Nov. 12, 744.

Furnished Quarters.

Furniture provided at the public expense, Regulations.
Q. Nov. 6, 264.

Provision for Officers who have served in South Africa on same terms as those joining in Dec., 1902.
Q. Nov. 13, 863.

Interpreters—Pecuniary Advantages to Officers qualifying as Interpreters.
Q. Nov. 6, 264.

Position, Pay and Allowances—Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. Nov. 6, 268.

Omagh Barracks, Increasing Accommodation and Number of Troops proposed.
Q. Nov. 6, 268, 269.

Pay, Non-effective Pay and Allowances—List of Exceptions to Army Regulations, Presented, *Nov. 10*, 449.

Promotions—Length of Service, Royal Garrison Artillery Grievance.
Q. Nov. 18, 1233.

Recruiting.

Physical Standards, Alterations in.
Q. Nov. 19, 1351.

Statistics since the conclusion of the South African War.
Q. Nov. 19, 1351.

Recruits—System of Transfer of Details of Regiments from the Depots of the Regiment to outlying Barracks, Increasing Barrack Accommodation at Omagh, etc.
Qs. Nov. 6, 268, 269.

Reorganisation Proposals — Increase in Pay, Additional Military Burden imposed on India, Viceroy's Protest, etc.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 486 ; Sir C. Dilke, 511.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
- Reservists.
  - Civilian Duties, Employment of Reservists — Garrison Artillery Experiment. *Q. Nov. 6*, 269.
  - Delay in Payment. *Qs. Nov. 11*, 591.
  - Number of Unemployed Reservists referred to in Letter issued by Lord Roberts and Mr. Brodrick. *Q. Nov. 17*, 1117.
  - Rejoining the Army—Conditions. *Q. Nov, 19*, 1354.
- Sandhurst Military College—Safe distribution of Letters, Arrangements for cashing crossed Cheques, etc. *Q. Nov. 10*, 457.
- Special Sanitary Officers, Proposed Appointment—Nature of Duties. *Q. Nov. 10*, 455.
- Spanton, Mr. J. P., Promotion to rank of Veterinary Captain, Qualifications, etc. *Q. Nov. 14*, 1036.
- Staff Appointments, Tenure reduced from five years to three. *Q. Nov. 11*, 592.
- Time-expired Men—Age limit for re-enlistment. *Q. Nov 6*, 269.
- Transport Service, *see* that title.
- Veterinary Department.
  - Officers who accompanied Remount Officers abroad, Status of. *Q. Nov. 11*, 587.
  - Promotion of Mr. J. P. Spanton to rank of Veterinary Captain, Qualifications, etc. *Q. Nov. 14*, 1036.
- Volunteers, *see* that title.
- War Office, *see* that title.
- Woolwich Arsenal.
  - Wages of Workmen in Danger Buildings, Infringement of Fair Wage Resolution, alleged. *Q. Nov. 5*, 139.
  - Williams, Lieut.-Col. A. B., holding dual position of Collector of Income Tax and Paymaster to the Royal Arsenal, *Q. Nov. 10*, 457.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Belfast, N.]
- Ammunition—Practice Ammunition thrown overboard, alleged, *Nov. 6*, 269.
- Armour for Cruisers of 1901 Programme—Date of placing Orders, *Nov. 4*, 6.
- Channel Fleet, Proportion of Able Seamen and Boys carried—Proportion on the "Magnificent," *Nov. 6*, 270.
- Coal.
  - New Zealand Coal, Kind of Coal supplied to the China Squadron, *Nov. 13*, 868.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*
- Coal—*cont.*
  - Welsh and New Zealand Coal, Comparisons between—Price, Amount carried on Ships of War, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1355.
- "Cressy," H.M.S.—Result of Speed Trials, *Nov. 19*, 1356.
- "Good Hope," Route arranged for Mr. Chamberlain's Tour — Cost of the "Good Hope," etc., *Nov. 11*, 589.
- "Hyacinth." H.M.S.—Defects in Machinery, Experiments with Screws, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1356.
- Londonderry Shipbuilding yard—Inspection by the Admiralty, Placing on the Admiralty List, etc., *Nov. 12*, 759.
- Mediterranean Fleet—Names of Vessels forming Fleet in June, 1901, and Nov., 1902, Stores and Coal Requirements, *Nov. 11*, 588.
- Pensions of Chief Petty Officers, Increase in, *Nov. 11*, 589.

Artillery
- Mountain Artillery, Officers receiving lower pay than Officers of Garrison Artillery. *Q. Nov. 13*, 865.
- Royal Garrison Artillery—Promotion Grievance. *Q. Nov. 18*, 1233.

Artisans' Cottages, Ireland
- Newbridge—Board of Works refusing to issue final instalment of Loan, alleged. *Q. Nov. 19*, 1362.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Beds, Luton]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 7*, 419.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 18*, 1293.
  - Closure by Compartments, 708, 709.

Assam
- Government Liquor Shops and the Tea Industry—Tea Planters' Memorandum, Charges against the Excise Department, etc.
  - *Debate on Indian Financial Statement, Nov. 10*, 527, 539.
    - Inquiry by Commissioners of Labour, 537.
    - Labour Supply Difficulty, Connection with the Agitation against the Excise Administration, 541.
    - Nature of Intoxicants supplied by Government — Amount of Fusel Oil in Spirit, etc., 526, 530, 535, 545.
    - Revenue derived from, 548.
    - Smuggling and Illicit Distillation, Extent of, 534, 546.

Assizes, Ireland
Belfast—Holding Winter Assizes in Belfast.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1124.
North-West Winter Assizes, Holding in Londonderry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 596.
Winter Assizes—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130 ; *Nov. 10*, 450.

Asylums
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum—Patient inflicting injuries on Attendant, Precautions.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1121.

Athlone
Police, Outbreak of Fever among—Cost of Medical Attendance at the Fever Hospital, Refusal of Payment by Inspector-General of the Constabulary, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 455.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
Assizes — Holding North-West Winter Assizes in Londonderry, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 596, 597.
Bagnalstown Petty Sessions Summonses—Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in Cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners, *Nov. 19*, 1361, 1362.
Bankers (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 856.
Bankruptcy Procedure—Official Assignees Appeals, Amount of Costs paid out of unclaimed dividend account in Bank of Ireland, *Nov. 5*, 144.
Belfast.
  Lindsay, H.—Prosecution for Assault, *Nov. 17*, 1125, 1126, 1127.
  Winter Assizes — Establishment of Court for trying Civil Cases and Appeals, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1124.
  Dublin Recorder's Court, Accumulation of Cases—Extending Jurisdiction of Court of Conscience, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1362.
  Henry and Others v. Hamill and Moody—Intervention of the Irish Executive proposed, *Nov. 13*, 877.
  Longford Registry of Titles—Registering Titles a second time under New Rules, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1125.
  Roscommon, County and District Council Elections — Re-elected Councillors acting as paid Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks at Contested Elections, *Nov. 17*, 1124.
  Sanitary Laws, Enforcement of—Dismissal of Prosecutions at Carlow, *Nov. 12*, 755.

Atlantic Shipping Trade
Cunard Company, *see* that title.

Attorney-General
Rt. Hon. Sir R. Finlay.

Attorney-General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Australasia
Pacific Cable Rates between England and Australasia.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 859.
Post and Telegraphs Bill—Difficulties in regard to Employment of Coloured Labour on Mail Steamers.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 869.

Austria-Hungary
British Ambassador, Late British Ambassador—Publication of Sir H. Rumbold's Reminiscences.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 871.

Autumn Sitting of the House.
Business which may be taken, Precedents of the past 100 years, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 91, 92, 108 ; Mr. Ritchie, 106, 107.
Supply—Re-opening Committee of Supply on a Motion by the Chancellor of the Exchequer after the Passage of the Appropriation Bill, *see* Supply—Procedure.

Bagnalstown
Petty Sessions Summonses—Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in Cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1361.
Water Supply, Improvement in.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1362.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Balfour, Capt. C. B. [Middlesex, Hornsey.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 6*, 322.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, *E.*]
Autumn Sittings—Business which may properly be taken at—Mr. Balfour's Action in regard to Autumn Sitting of 1882.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 92 ; Mr. Ritchie, 107.
Business of the House — Replies to Questions, *Nov. 5*, 150 ; *Nov. 10*, 469 ; *Nov. 11*, 603 ; *Nov. 17*, 1131.
Commerce, Minister of — Appointment proposed, *Nov. 13*, 882.
Cunard Company, Government Agreement with—Date of Presentation, *Nov. 11*, 602.
Education, Board of—Permanent Secretary, Retirement of Sir G. Kekewich and appointment of Mr. Morant, *Nov. 10*, 467.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 18, 35, 53, 54, 63, 117, 118, 119; *Nov. 5*, 153, 154, 155, 158, 159, 162, 164, 178, 180, 205; *Nov. 6*, 281, 282, 283, 284, 291, 293, 294, 308, 314, 319, 323, 324, 359, 364, 368, 373; *Nov. 7*, 393, 394, 395, 396, 401, 427, 433, 435, 438, 440, 442; *Nov. 12*, 762, 766, 778, 780, 785, 801, 805, 806, 829, 830, 831; *Nov. 13*, 893, 896, 941, 959, 961, 962; *Nov. 14*, 1048, 1052, 1055, 1057, 1064; *Nov. 17*, 1144, 1146, 1160, 1181; *Nov. 18*, 1250, 1253, 1261, 1262, *Nov. 19*, 1372, 1373, 1375, 1382, 1383, 1386, 1394, 1426, 1445, 1459, 1460, 1461, 1462, 1467.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill.
  - Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 607, 614, 629, 724, 726, 727, 728, 733, 735.
  - Criticism of Mr. Balfour for making a Political Speech at Manchester during the Passage of the Bill through the House.
    O. Mr. J. Ellis, *Nov. 11*, 657.
  - Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1131, 1138, 1140, 1141.
  - Grant-in-Aid Clause, Government Changes in, *Nov. 14*, 1037.
  - Rate—Product of the Penny Rate, *Nov. 13*, 882.
  - Religious Instruction—Managers' Decisions subjected to appeal to Episcopal Authority where Trust Deed provides for it, *Nov. 19*, 1365.
  - School Buildings — Denominational Schools leased to School Boards.
    - Preventing re-transfer to Managers, *Nov. 17*, 1130.
    - Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as Denominational School, *Nov. 5*, 149, 150.
  - Trust Deeds, Preventing execution of Sham Trust Deeds, *Nov. 19*, 1365.
- Gibraltar—Harbour on Eastern side of the Rock, Engineer's Report—Laying on the Table, *Nov. 19*, 1366.
- Indian Budget—Opportunity for resuming Debate, *Nov. 10*, 469, 470; *Nov. 11*, 602; *Nov. 18*, 1238.
- Ireland.
  - Crimes Acts, Administration of—Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances, etc., *Nov. 4*, 14.
  - University Education, Royal Commission—Date of Report, *Nov. 17*, 1129.
- Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill—Introduction of as principal Irish Measure next Session, *Nov. 12*, 754.
- London Water Bill — Daily printing of Amendments, *Nov. 4*, 15.
- Municipal Trading—Appointment of Royal Commission, proposed *Nov. 17*, 1130.
- Naval Administration—Royal Commission proposed, *Nov. 13*, 882, 883.
- Orders of Knighthood, Decorations, etc., Dates of Institution, Advice of Ministers as to Distribution of—Return proposed, *Nov. 10*, 467.
- Revenue and Expenditure.
  - Appropriation Accounts, Expediting delivery to Comptroller and Auditor-General, *Nov. 19*, 1366.
  - National Finance Accounts, Expediting Printing and distribution of, *Nov. 19*, 1367.
- Street Traffic in London—Royal Commission proposed, *Nov. 11*, 601; *Nov. 12*, 760.
- Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Opportunity for Discussion, *Nov. 11*, 600.
  - Sanction by Parliament — Notice of Debate, *Nov. 10*, 468.
- Transvaal Grant, Vote for—Motion to set up Committee of Supply, Mr. Balfour's Absence from the House during Discussion of Motion.
  O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 92, 96.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

- Alien Immigration, Royal Commission—No Meeting held since July, *Nov. 5*, 140.
- Ireland.
  - Rock Angus, Lighting proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1127.
  - Wreckage off the Donegal Coast—Steps taken to remove, *Nov. 12*, 757.
- Iron and Steel—Canadian Exports of Bounty-fed Iron and Steel, Quantity Imported into Great Britain, etc., *Nov. 4*, 8, 9.
- North Sea Fisheries Investigation, International Scheme—Contributions of various Countries, *Nov. 4*, 8.
- Railway Servants, Hours of Labour—Case of Guard at Hither Green Station, *Nov. 12*, 747.
- Railways.
  - Accidents.
    - Larbert—Board of Trade Inquiry, *Nov. 13*, 872.
    - Newry—Notification to the Board of Trade, *Nov. 12*, 757.
    - Thames Ironworks Level Crossing —Fatal Accident to Henry Eade, *Nov. 12*, 748.
  - Side Brakes on Railway Wagons—Result of Meeting of Railway Officials, *Nov. 12*, 747.
- South African Shipping Combine—Notification of increase in Freight Rates, Powers of the Board of Trade to intervene, *Nov. 10*, 460.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom—Delay in Distribution, *Nov. 19*, 1359.
Sugar Bounties—Rate of Ontario Bounty on Beet Sugar, *Nov. 6*, 271.

Ballaghaderreen
Casey, Mr. James, Publican—Refusal of Transfer of Licence.
Q. Nov. 6, 274.

Bank of England
Scinde, Punjab and Delhi Railway—Deposit at the Bank belonging to Shareholders, Treasury Acquiring Control.
Q. Nov. 5, 134.

Bankers (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill
c. 2R. *Nov. 4*, 127, *Nov. 5*, 254.
Com. Nov. 12, 856.

Bankruptcy
Companies, Winding up—Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 14*, 1033; *Nov. 17*, 1098.
Irish Procedure—Official Assignees' Appeals, Amount of Costs paid out of Unclaimed Dividend Account in Bank of Ireland.
Q. Nov. 5, 144.
Undistributed Moneys belonging to Bankrupts' Estates—Return showing Name of Bankrupt, Court and Number, Date of Receiving Order, etc., Return Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1098.

Barbour, Sir David
Indian Salt Tax, Sir D. Barbour's Opinion.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 496.

Barlow, Mr. J. E. [Somerset, Frome]
Bengal, Expediting Administration of Justice, *Nov. 13*, 868.

Barracks
Omagh Barracks, Increasing Accommodation and Number of Troops proposed.
Qs. Nov. 6, 268, 269.

Barran, Mr. R. H. [Leeds, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 13*, 929.

Bartley, Mr. G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 7*, 387, 431.

Basic Slag
Spurious Slag, Importation of—Proceedings against Agent, Protection for Farmers, etc.
Q. Nov. 4, 3.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
Africa, South—Grant for Re-building and Re-stocking Farms, Amount Expended, *Nov. 5*, 137.
Uganda Railway, Provision of further Funds, *Nov. 11*, 594.
Zanzibar, Slavery in—Case of Slave Girl Msichoke, *Nov. 11*, 586.

Beckett, Mr. E. W. [York, N.R., Whitby]
Garrison Regiments, Official Reports as to Conduct and Efficiency of, *Nov. 12*, 746.

Beet Sugar
Canadian Bounty, Rate of—Exports to the United Kingdom.
Q. Nov. 6, 271.

Belfast
Assizes, Holding Winter Assizes in Belfast—Establishment of Court for trying Civil Cases and Appeals, proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1124.
Borough Accounts—Non-publication of Auditor's Report.
Q. Nov. 5, 146.
Infirmary—Death of Child, Medical Officer refusing to grant Death Certificate.
Q. Nov. 10, 463.
Lindsay, H.—Prosecution for Assault.
Os. Nov. 17, 1125.
Macauley's, Mr. J., Disloyal Speech—Government Action.
Q. Nov. 13, 880.
Police Barracks, Number of—Number of Sergeants, etc.
Q. Nov. 13, 879.
Postmen's Maximum Wage, Rate of, compared to Dublin.
Q. Nov. 10, 462.
Telephone Service, Establishment of Trunk Telephone from Belfast to Londonderry—Post Office requiring Guarantee.
Q. Nov. 17, 1109.
Valuation—Re-valuation, Names, Qualifications, etc., of Valuers.
Q. Nov. 19, 1363.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 848.
Railways.
  Hours of Labour of Railway Servants,—Case of Guard at Hither Green Station, *Nov. 12*, 747.
  Newry Railway Accident—Notification to the Board of Trade, *Nov. 12*, 757.
  Side Brakes on Railway Wagons—Result of Meeting of Railway Officials, *Nov. 12*, 747.
  Thames Ironworks Level Crossing—Fatal Accident to Henry Eade, *Nov. 12*, 747.
South African Shipping Combine—Notification of Increase in Freight Rates, Powers of the Board of Trade to intervene, *Nov. 10*, 459.

Ben Wyvis
Grazings on Southern Slope, Converting into Deer Forest—Securing Grazings for Crofters' Holdings, proposed.
Q. Nov. 5, 142.

Benefices
Lombard Street, Amalgamation of Parishes, proposed—Vacancy of All Hallows Church.
Q. *Nov 4*, 5.

Bengal
Justice, Expediting Administration of.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 868.

Bentley and Bordon Light Railway
Order Presented, *Nov. 10*, 452; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Beresford, Lord C. [Woolwich]
Mediterranean Fleet—Names of Vessels forming Fleet in June, 1901, and Nov., 1902, Stores and Coal Requirements, *Nov. 11*, 588.
Militia—Strength and Recruiting Statistics, *Nov. 12*, 745.
Navy.
Boilers, Return of, Oct. 17th, 1902—Expenses for Alterations and Additions with regard to Ships mentioned in Return, *Nov. 13*, 861.
Committees on Manning, Reserves, etc.—Date of Reports, *Nov. 5*, 133.
Ordnance Department Vacancies, Claims of Warrant Officers, *Nov. 17*, 1112.
Pensions—Increase in Pensions of Chief Petty Officers, *Nov. 11*, 589.
Volunteers.
Establishment Statistics, Number of Resignations, etc., *Nov. 12*, 745.
Second Kent Garrison Artillery—Armament, Delay in issue of 6-inch Howitzers, *Nov. 10*, 456.

Berks, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1346.

Betting Telegrams
Clerks in receipt of 12s. to 30s. per week, Preventing Employment in Transmission of Sporting Telegrams.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 132.
Money Orders containing Instructions as to Bets, Preventing use of Telegraph Service for Gambling Transactions.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 131.

Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway (Abandonment) Bill
l. 3R.* *Nov. 17*, 1098.
Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. [Bethnal Green]
India.
Agriculture, Position as Industry, Need for Technical Instruction, Disabilities of British Indian Subjects in the Colonies, Extension of Lord Curzon's Term of Office, etc., *Nov. 10*, 549.
Commercial Interests in China, Effect of Continuance of Silver Standard in the Philippine Islands on *Nov. 10*, 459.
Debate on the Budget—Continuing at Evening Sitting, proposed, *Nov. 10* 469.

Bills
Carrying over partly-considered Bills from one Session to another, Merits and Demerits of proposal as a Method of expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 616.
Committee proposed, to which all Bills might be referred to fix period for reasonable discussion.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 11*, 708.

Birmingham
Chamberlain, Mr. J.—Farewell Demonstration on Departure for South Africa.
References to, in Debate on Motion for Application of Closure by Compartments to the Education Bill, Nov. 11, 704, 709.
Education Bill Conference.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 664; Sir W. Holland, 682.

Boilers
Cunard Company, Government Agreement with—Type of Boilers in new Vessels.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 132.
Navy, *see* that title.

Bond, Mr. E. [Nottingham, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 178; *Nov. 6*, 311; *Nov. 7*, 401; *Nov. 19*, 1467.
Street Traffic in London, Breaking up Streets—Royal Commission, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1116.

Boroughs
County Boroughs, Ireland—Rateable Value, Borrowing Powers, Amount Borrowed and amount of Loans repaid, Return Ordered, *Nov. 14*, 1034.

Boscawen, Mr. G. [Kent, Tunbridge]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 17*, 1206, 1207, 1223; *Nov. 18*, 1310.

Bousfield, Mr. W. R. [Hackney, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 6*, 366, 368; *Nov. 13*, 944; *Nov. 17*, 1192; *Nov. 18*, 1311, 1312, 1315, 1325.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 679.

Bowles, Mr. G. [Lynn Regis]
Appropriation Bill, Examination of, by the First Lord of the Treasury, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 469.
British Orders of Knighthood, Decorations, etc., Dates of Institution, Advice of Ministers as to Distribution of—Return proposed, *Nov. 10*, 466.
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Nov. 5*, 150.
Cunard Company, Government Agreement with—Date of Presentation, *Nov. 11*, 602.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 17*, 1164.

[*cont.*

Bowles, Mr. G.—*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1132.

Gibraltar—Harbour on Eastern Side of the Rock, Engineer's Report—Laying on the Table, *Nov. 19*, 1365.

Revenue and Expenditure.

Appropriation Accounts, Expediting delivery to Comptroller and Auditor-General, *Nov. 19*, 1366.

National Finance Accounts, Expediting printing and distribution of, *Nov. 19*, 1367.

Somaliland Campaign—British Troops conveyed to Berbera in subsidised German steamer "Bundesrath," Identity of the "Bundesrath," *Nov. 10*, 458.

South African War Medals—Granting to Yeomanry Battalions sent to South Africa in 1902, *Nov. 19*, 1354.

Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom—Delay in distribution, *Nov. 19*, 1359.

Sugar Bounties Convention, Expenditure to be incurred — Form of Financial Resolution, *Nov. 10*, 468.

Supply Procedure, Re-opening Committee of Supply after the Passage of the Appropriation Bill on a Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Unconstitutional and unprecedented Action of the Government, Courses which may properly be followed in emergencies necessitating new Expenditure, etc., *Nov. 4*, 84, 107.

Boy Sailors

Number with the Channel Fleet—Number on board H.M.S. "Magnificent."
Q. *Nov. 6*, 270.

Boyle, No. 2, District Council

Labourers Acts — Complaint of delay in issue of Supplemental Loan.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 145.

Brakes

Side Brakes on Railway Wagons—Result of Meeting of Railway Officials.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Brigg, Mr. J. [York, W.R., Keighley]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 5*, 180, 186; *Nov. 6*, 371; *Nov. 12*, 783; *Nov. 13*, 917; *Nov. 14*, 1056.

Bristol

Foreign Animals Wharf Revocation Order Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1098, 1104.

"Britannic," Transport

Number of Troops embarked from South Africa for Australia on 7th July, Number of Deaths.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1116.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]

Education (England and Wales) Bill *com.* *Nov. 4*, 50; *Nov. 6*, 357, 358; *Nov. 12*, 836, 838.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 670.

War Office, Works Department—Report of Departmental Committee, *Nov. 6*, 265

Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum

Patient Inflicting Injuries on Attendant—Precautions.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1121.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*Secretary of State for War* [Surrey, Guildford]

Civil Employment for Discharged Soldiers, War Office Measures, *Nov. 5*, 138.

Commissions.

Militia Officers enlisting in the Army to serve in South Africa, Granting Commissions to, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 267.

Volunteer Officers commanding Active Service Companies during the South African War, Granting Army Commissions to, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 746.

Garrison Regiments—Official Reports as to Conduct and Efficiency of, *Nov. 12*, 746.

Ireland—Arrangements for Construction of Port Erlin Boat Slip, *Nov. 12*, 759.

Leonard, Sergeant — Degradation to the Ranks for writing to the Secretary of State for War, *Nov. 17*, 1118.

Medical Corps Officers serving in India—Relief Programme, Exclusion of Officers with less than six years' service in India, *Nov. 10*, 456.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill, 2R., *Nov. 10*, 578, 579, 580.

Officers, Position, Pay and Allowances—Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 268.

Recruits, System of sending Recruits to outlying Barracks — Increasing Accommodation of Omagh Barracks, etc., *Nov. 6*, 269.

Reservists.

Civilian Duties, Employment on—Garrison Artillery Experiment, *Nov. 6*, 269.

Number of Unemployed Reservists referred to in Letter issued by Lord Roberts and Mr. Brodrick, *Nov. 17*, 1117.

Sandhurst Royal Military College—Safe distribution of Letters, Arrangements for cashing crossed Cheques, etc., *Nov. 10*, 457.

[*cont.*

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*cont.*
South African War.
Honours for War Office Officials, *Nov. 17*, 1117.
Medals—Dates of Service, Effect of Regulations on Colonial Troops, *Nov. 17*, 1118.
Time-expired Men—Age Limit for re-enlistment, *Nov. 6*, 269.
Woolwich Arsenal.
Wages of Workmen in Danger Buildings — Infringement of the Fair Wages Resolution, alleged, *Nov. 5*, 139.
Williams, Lieut.-Col. A. B., holding dual position of Collector of Income Tax and Paymaster to the Royal Arsenal, *Nov. 10*, 457.

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, etc.) Bill
l. Commons' Amendts. *con.* Nov. 10*, 449.
Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Bronze Scroll Work Lamps on London Bridge
Advertising for Sale.
Q. Nov. 4, 4.

Brookfield, Col. [Sussex, Rye]
Clerical Department of the War Office—Rules as to employment of Ex-Officers and Soldiers, *Nov. 12*, 744.

Brown, Mr. A. H. [Shropshire, Wellington]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 180.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 72, 76; *Nov. 5*, 187, 203, 204; *Nov. 6*, 287, 290, 328, 330, 335, 358; *Nov. 7*, 437; *Nov. 12*, 785; *Nov. 13*, 917, 947, 952; *Nov. 19*, 1446, 1447, 1460.

Brussels
Sugar Bounties Convention, *see* Sugar Bounties.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Nov. 18*, 1238.
City Parochial Charities Act, 1883—Meaning of Ecclesiastical Section, *Nov. 13*, 875.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 47, 54, 57, 116, 117; *Nov. 5*, 154, 160, 186, 188, 197, 199; *Nov. 6*, 284, 290, 298, 299, 310, 321, 334, 335, 351, 360; *Nov. 7*, 393, 394, 395, 396, 425, 434; *Nov. 12*, 780, 835; *Nov. 13*, 896, 908, 934, 935, 947, 954, 959; *Nov. 14*, 1042, 1045, 1053, 1054, 1057, 1058, 1064, 1066, 1068; *Nov. 17*, 1154, 1198, 1199, 1201, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1223; *Nov. 18*, 1246, 1251, 1259, 1272, 1285, 1307, 1311, 1316, 1319, 1332; *Nov. 19*, 1382, 1383, 1402, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1427, 1459, 1466.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill—Introduction next Session as principal Irish Measure, *Nov. 12*, 754.
Street Traffic in London—Royal Commission proposed, *Nov. 11*, 601.

Buckingham, Mr. James
Assam Tea Planters and the Government Grog Shops—Memorandum on Planters' Grievance.
References to, in Debate on Indian Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 528, 535, 539.

Building Bye Laws
District Councils' Restrictive Bye Laws.
Q. Nov. 13, 872.

Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway
Surplus Profit—Enforcing Section 5 of Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883.
Q. Nov. 13, 873.

"Bundesrath"
Somaliland Campaign—British Troops conveyed to Berbera in subsidised German Steamer.
Qs. Nov. 10, 457, 458.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
Land Settlement in South Africa—Irrigation the key to Settlement, Comparison between circumstances of South Africa and Southern Alberta, Canada, *Nov. 5*, 214, 216.

Bushey Park
Condition of Road made over to Tramway Company.
Q. Nov. 7, 382.

Business of the House
Amendments to a Resolution (Closure by Compartments) — Putting the First Amendment in such a form as to reserve other Amendments of which Notice had been given.
Os. Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 604.
Carrying over partly considered Business from one Session to another as a Method of Expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 617.
Congested State of Business.
Closure by Compartments of the Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* Closure.
Committee, Appointment of, for Distribution of Parliamentary Time, proposed.
O. Mr. P. Smith, *Nov. 11*, 647.
Course of Business—Mr. A. J. Balfour's Replies to Questions, *Nov. 5*, 150; *Nov. 10*, 469; *Nov. 11*, 603; *Nov. 17*, 1131.
Indian Budget, Date of resuming Debate.
Q. Nov. 10, 469; *Nov. 11*, 602; *Nov. 18*, 1238.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 846.
South African War Medals—Dates of Service, Effect of Regulations on Colonial Troops, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1118.

Butterine Bill
Re-introduction of, under title of Adulterated Butter Bill, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 10*, 461.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 27, 56 ; *Nov. 7*, 435 ; *Nov. 13*, 926, 927, 951 ; *Nov. 19*, 1396, 1451.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1140, 1141.
London Water Bill.—Daily Printing of Amendments, *Nov.* 4, 14.
Southwark Denominational Schools, Rebuilding—Application of Money from City Parochial Charities Fund, *Nov. 13*, 874, 875.

Cable Communication
Pacific Cable Rates between England and Australia.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 859.
Revenue Derived from Cable Messages—State Purchase of Cables, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1108.

Caine, Mr. W. S. [Cornwall, Camborne]
India.
Budget—Notation employed in Explanatory Memorandums, *Nov. 7*, 384.
Coronation Guests and Troops, Expenses of, *Nov. 7*, 383.
Expenditure, Increase in—Increase in Consumption of Intoxicants, Charge against Excise Department of Indian Government, Assam Tea Planters' Complaint, etc., *Nov. 10*, 521, 543, 544, 546.
Scinde, Punjab and Delhi Railway—Deposit at Bank of England belonging to Shareholders, Treasury acquiring Control, *Nov. 5*, 134.
Phthisis among Cornish Miners—Nature of Home Office Inquiry, *Nov. 5*, 133.
Telegraph Service—Betting Telegrams.
Clerks in receipt of 12s. to 30s. per week, Preventing Employment in transmission of Sporting Telegrams, *Nov. 5*, 132.
Money Orders containing Instructions as to Bets, Preventing use of Telegraph Service for Gambling Transactions, *Nov. 5*, 131.
Transvaal—Publication of Liquor Ordinance, *Nov. 5*, 136.

Calderwood v. M'Curdy
Police Evidence at Quarter Sessions—Proceedings under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 276.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid]
Bankers (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill, 2R., *Nov. 4*, 127 ; *Nov. 5*, 254, 255, 256 ; *com.* *Nov. 12*, 856.
Militia and Yeomanry Bill, 2R., *Nov. 10*, 578.
Osborne Estate Bill, 2R., *Nov. 10*, 583.
Osborne Estate Bill—Excerpt from Queen Victoria's Will, Laying on the Table, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1241.
Scottish Parliamentary Register—Number of Persons removed from the Register in 1901 for non-payment of Rates, Return, *Nov. 17*, 1107.
Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, 2R., *Nov. 5*, 252.

Campbell, Mr. J. [Armagh, S.]
Firearms Discharge on Public Road near Silverbridge, Prosecution, *Nov. 13*, 863.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
Autumn Sitting. Business which may properly be taken at—Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman's Action in regard to Autumn Sitting of 1882.
O. Mr. Ritchie, *Nov. 4*, 107.
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Nov. 5*, 150, *Nov. 17*, 1131.
Chamberlain's, Mr. J., Parliamentary Methods of Expression—Position attributed to Sir W. Harcourt as to the Transvaal Grant-in-Aid, etc., *Nov. 5*, 242.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 5th*, 153, 154 ; *Nov. 12*, 847 ; *Nov 18*, 1253.
Education (England and Wales) Bill
Closure by Compartments, *Nov 11*, 621, 629, 694, 695, 697, 701.
Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1131, 1132.
Sugar Bounties Convention, Sanction by Parliament—Adequate time for discussion of Resolution, *Nov. 10*, 468.
Transvaal and Orange River Colony Grant-in-Aid—Allocation of Grant, Question of recognition of Boer Requisition Notes, Scale of Compensation as between Burghers and Loyalists, *Nov. 5*, 243.

Canada
Cattle, Importation of—into England—Law requiring Cattle to be Slaughtered at Port of Landing.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 461.
Irrigation in the North-West Territory, Success of.
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *Nov. 5*, 215.
Mail Service to Great Britain—Sligo as a Port of Call proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.
Ontario Bounties on Beet Sugar Exports, Rate of—Imports into the United Kingdom, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 271

[*cont.*

Canada—*cont.*
Pig Iron and Steel, Rate of Bounty on Exports—Quantity imported into Great Britain.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 8.

Cann Hall District
Position of, under the Education (England and Wales) Bill—Question of Local Authority.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1230.

Canteens
Army—Continuance of Tenant System.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1240, 1241.

Cape Colony.
British Navy, Contributions to, etc.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Nov. 11*, 590.
Loyalists, Compensation for War Losses—Question of Inclusion in Grant to Transvaal and Orange River Colony Loyalists.
Observations in Committee of Supply, *Nov. 5*, 224, 225, 239; *Report of Supply*, *Nov. 6*, 343, 345.
Parliament, Members of—British Officers' fraudulent attempts to obtain evidence of Malpractices against.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1036.

Carew, Mr. J. L. [Neath, S.]
Ireland.
Bagnalstown.
Petty Sessions Summonses—Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners, *Nov. 19*, 1361.
Water Supply, Improvement in, *Nov. 19*, 1362.
Bankruptcy Procedure—Official Assignees' Appeals, *Nov. 5*, 144.
Census—Delay in issue of Armagh, Antrim and Tipperary Returns, *Nov. 5*, 147.
Letters and Postcards addressed in Irish, Non-delivery of—Appointment of Post Office Officials having a knowledge of the Irish Language, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 756.
Local Government Report, Want of Index, *Nov. 5*, 148.
Newbridge Artisans' Cottages—Board of Works refusing to issue final instalment of Loan, *Nov. 19*, 1362.
Roscrea.
Justices of the Peace—Appointment of Additional Justices proposed, *Nov. 13*, 878.
Labourers' Cottages—Selection of Sites by the District Council, *Nov. 12*, 751.

Carew, Mr. J. L.—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Sanitary Laws, Enforcement of—Dismissal of Prosecutions at Carlow, *Nov. 12*, 755.
Tara, Hill of—Excavations, Steps taken to preserve Historical Monuments from destruction, *Nov. 10*, 463.
University Education, Royal Commission—Date of Report, *Nov. 17*, 1129.

Carlow
Prosecutions under the Sanitary Laws dismissed—Enforcing the Law, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 755.

Carmarthen
Great Western Railway Breakdown—Board of Trade Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1035.
Population as given in the last Census.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 454.
Technical Instruction in the County—Minute sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act of 1889, Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1345.

Carndonagh
Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Surplus Profit—Enforcing Section 5 of Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 873.
Calduff-Carndonagh Railway, Extension of—Government Grant-in-Aid proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1231.
Letters—Delay in Delivery.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 881.

Carrick-on-Shannon
Prison—Handing over disused Prison to Leitrim Agricultural and Technical Committee.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

"Carrying Over" Business
Merits and Demerits of "Carrying over" from one session to another as a method of expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 617

Casey, Mr. J.
Ballaghaderreen—Refusal of Transfer of Publican's Licence to Mr. Casey.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 274.

Cattle and Live Stock
Canadian Cattle, Importation of—Law requiring Cattle to be slaughtered at Port of Landing.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 461.

Cawley, Mr. F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
Army Clothing Contracts—Provision in Tenders for work to be carried out in Factories, *Nov. 18*, 1239.

Cecil, Lord Hugh [Greenwich]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 18*, 1291 ; *Nov. 19*, 1380, 1401, 1402, 1412.

Census
Carmarthen—Population as given in the last Census.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 454.
England and Wales—Return Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1346.
Ireland—Delay in issue of Armagh, Antrim and Tipperary Returns.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 147.

Central Telegraph Office
Male Clerks placed under control of Women Supervisors—Abolition of Practice, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1109.

Chairman of Committees
Rt. Hon. J. W. Lowther.

Chairman of Committees [Lords]
Earl of Morley.

Chamberlain, Mr. Austen—*Postmaster-General* [Worcestershire, E.]
Employees.
Relatives, Supervision of Postal Officials by their Relatives—Case of Londonderry Postmaster's Daughter, *Nov. 19*, 1360.
Welsh Language, Rule as to Postal Officials having a knowledge of—Proportion of English to Welsh-speaking People in any Postal District, *Nov. 10*, 462.
Welsh and Irish speaking Officials, Number of Appointments since 1st January, 1902, *Nov. 13*, 870, 871.
Ireland.
Belfast Postmen's Maximum Wage, Rate of compared to Dublin, *Nov. 10*, 462.
Carndonagh, Delay in delivery of Letters, *Nov. 13*, 881.
Letters and postcards addressed in Irish, Non-delivery of—Appointment of Irish-speaking Post Office Officials, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 273 ; *Nov. 10*, 463 ; *Nov. 12*, 756.
Londonderry Postal Arrangements Sunday Morning Delivery—Resolution from Londonderry Corporation, *Nov. 12*, 756.
Lurgan Post Office, Insanitary condition of temporary premises, alleged —Delay in erection of new Post Office, etc., *Nov. 6*, 273.
Mail Service.
China—Superiority of the Overland Route to Mail Steamships, *Nov. 13*, 869.
Contracts—Date of Termination of P. & O. and Orient Contracts, *Nov. 13*, 869.

Chamberlain, Mr. Austen—*cont.*
Mail Service—*cont.*
United States — Discontinuance of Accelerated Mail Train Service in connection with mid-week mails *via* Queenstown, *Nov. 18*, 1235.
Pencils—Supply of British-made instead of Foreign-made Pencils to the Telegraph Service, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 462.
Stornoway Mail Service — Condition of Messrs. Macbrayne's Steamers, *Nov. 5*, 141 ; *Nov. 18*, 1235.
Telegraph Service.
Age Retirement, Enforcing, *Nov. 13*, 870.
Re-direction of Telegrams free of charge by post, proposed, *Nov. 13*, 870.
Telephone Service.
Post Office System—Amount expended, Number of Subscribers, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1359, 1360.
Tunbridge Wells Municipal System, Purchase by National Telephone Co. — Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk, *Nov. 11*, 602.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Birmingham, W.]
Africa, South—Tour in South African Colonies—Route of the "Good Hope."
Q. *Nov. 11*, 589.
Birmingham—Farewell Demonstration on Departure of Mr. Chamberlain for South Africa.
References to in Debate on Motion for Application of Closure by Compartments to the Education Bill, *Nov. 11*, 704, 709.
Colonial Premiers Conference—Omission of Speeches of the Colonial Premiers from the Blue-book, *Nov. 6*, 267.
Education (England and Wales) Bill — Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 691, 693, 695, 697, 699, 701, 705, 709.
Harcourt's, Sir William, Attitude on the Government's Change of Opinion as to source whence the Transvaal Grant-in-Aid was to be supplied— "Government either Knaves or Fools," *Nov. 5*, 233.
O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 242.
Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
Grant-in-Aid.
Absence of Mr. Chamberlain from the House during Discussion on Appropriation Bill.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Nov. 10*, 575 ; *Nov. 12*, 852.
Allocation of Grant, Purchase of Stock and Stores from the Military, Scale of Compensation as between Burghers and Loyalists, Question of inclusion of Natal and Cape Colony, Recognition of Boer Requisition Notes, etc., *Nov. 4*, 6 ; *Nov. 5*, 231, 237, 247.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Transvaal and Orange River Colony—*cont.*
Grant-in-Aid—*cont.*
Conference with Boer Generals, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1352.
Source from which the Grant was to be supplied—Difference in interpretation of Peace Terms between Government and the Boer Leaders, Reasons for Decision to adopt Boer view and take the Money from the Imperial Exchequer, etc., *Nov. 5*, 233, 234, 235.
Johannesburg Local Rates, Raising—Consent of the Governor of the Transvaal, *Nov. 6*, 266.
Repatriation—Number of Persons already repatriated, Number still in Concentration Camps, Number of Prisoners returned, and still to come, *Nov. 5*, 232, 241.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Sir William Walrond.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie.

Channel Fleet
Able Seamen and Boys, Proportion of—Proportion on Board H.M.S. "Magnificent."
Q. Nov. 6, 270.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 28, 30, 43, 44, 57, 119; *Nov. 5*, 160, 171, 184; *Nov. 6*, 297, 312, 313; *Nov. 7*, 391; *Nov. 13*, 906, 909, 912, 964; *Nov. 17*, 1182; *Nov. 18*, 1284; *Nov. 19*, 1414, 1448, 1449, 1467.
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Amendments—Government Amendments, Date of Introduction, etc., *Nov. 11*, 587.
Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 723.
Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1139.
School Buildings, Transfer to School Boards—Preventing re-transfer to Managers, *Nov. 17*, 1130, 1131.
Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.
Compensation for losses in War—Loan, Principle of Distribution, *Nov. 7*, 386.
Grant-in-Aid—Allocation of Grant to Loyalists, *Nov. 6*, 347.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Amendments to a Resolution on Business of the House—Putting the First Amendment in such a form as not to exclude other Amendments of which notice had been given, *Nov. 11*, 604.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 281; *Nov. 12*, 795, 797, 829, 830.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 638, 722, 725.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Charing Cross to the Mall
New Street, Date of Beginning Work.
Q. Nov. 17, 1122.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.

China
British Government entering into Reciprocal Agreement with Foreign Power—Statement proposed.
Q. Nov. 19, 1350.
Cotton Trade with India—Effect of Falling Silver.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 562.
Hong-Kong—Garrison Officers, Increase in Lodging and Servant Allowances, proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1115.
Mail Service—Superiority of the Overland Route to Mail Steamships.
Q. Nov. 13, 869.
Peking—Establishment of British Post Office proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1110.
Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 449
Yangtsze Valley, British Influence in.
Q. Nov. 4, 7.

China Squadron
Coal, Use of New Zealand Coal.
Qs. Nov. 13, 867; *Nov. 17*, 1105; *Nov. 18*, 1238, 1239.

Churchill, Lord Randolph
Autumn Sittings, Business which may properly be taken at—Lord R. Churchill's Action in regard to Autumn Sitting of 1882.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 91.

Churchill, Mr. Winston [Oldham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 13*, 890, 892.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Rent Free School Buildings, Payment of Ground-rent Charge, *Nov. 10*, 453.

Circuit System
Ireland Winter Assizes—Copy of Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130; *Nov. 10*, 450.

City Parochial Charities Fund
Application of Money to Re-building of Southwark Denominational Schools.
Q. Nov. 13, 874.

Civil Service
Abstractor Clerks—Personal Allowances or Gratuities, Extension of System proposed.
Q. Nov. 19, 1349.

[*cont.*

Civil Service—*cont.*
Appropriation Accounts, Expediting delivery to Comptroller and Auditor General.
Q. Nov. 19, 1366.
Examinations—Scale of Fees.
Q. Nov. 18, 1227.
Pensions and Superannuations.
Appointments requiring Special Qualifications—Treasury Minute Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 10*, 450.
Appointment without Certificate—Treasury Minute Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1097, 1104.
Total Number of Persons in the Civil Service of the State—Return Ordered, *Nov. 6*, 258.

Closure
Closure by Compartments of remainder of proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Amendments to Motion — Putting first Amendment in such a form as not to exclude other Amendments of which Notice had been given.
Qs. Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 604.
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Nov. 11*, 607—Amendments, 621, 721.
Agricultural Interest and Restriction of Debate on the Financial Clause, 667.
Amendments, Number accepted by the Government, justified prolonged Debate in Committee, 657, 699, 714.
Chair — Course pursued by the Chair, in 1893, 632.
Degradation of the House of Commons to the level of a Voting Machine, 644.
Foreign Competition, Argument in favour of further discussion, 670.
Minority opposed to the Bill, Number and character of the opposition, 610, 624, 696.
Minute Discussions, Growing tendency of the House to enter into every detail of every Question that came before it, 644, 645.
Obstruction, Question of, 611, 623, 652, 655, 659, 660, 673, 693, 694, 695.
Personal Closure, Merits and Demerits as a method of reducing debates within reasonable limits, 613, 635, 651, 689.
Precedents, 609, 622, 631, 638, 661, 685, 690, 710.
Remedies, Possible Methods of expediting Parliamentary Business 613.

Closure—*cont.*
Closure by Compartments, etc.—*cont.*
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour)—*cont.*
Roman Catholic Schools, Appeal on behalf of, 686.
Speeches, Duration of, 668.
Time spent on Debates in Committee, 610, 715.

Clyde
Port Local Authority, Glasgow Corporation Application—Laying Report upon the Table.
Q, Nov. 17, 1123,

Clyde Company, Cork
Congested Districts Board Subsidy to—Injury to trade of the Port of Limerick alleged.
Q. Nov. 12, 752.

Coal
Navy
New Zealand Coal, Kind of Coal supplied to the China Squadron.
Qs. Nov. 13, 867; *Nov. 17*, 1105; *Nov. 18*, 1238, 1239.
Welsh and New Zealand Coal—Comparisons in relation of Bulk to Weight, Effectiveness in development of Steam, Difference in Price, etc.
Q. Nov. 19, 1355.

Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.—*Under Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Ayrshire, N.]
Aliens—Number charged at Metropolitan Police Courts last year—Restrictive Legislation, proposed, *Nov. 19*. 1358.
Cottages, Erection of—District Councils' Restrictive Bye-Laws, *Nov. 13*, 872.
Police on Duty in Palace Yard—Regulations as to wearing Greatcoats, *Nov. 19*, 1358.

Cohen, Mr. B. [Islington, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill,—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11* 683.
Municipal Trading — Appointment o Royal Commission, proposed, *Nov. 17* 1129.

Colomb, Sir J. [Great Yarmouth.]
Bronze Scroll Work Lamps on London Bridge, Advertising for Sale, *Nov. 4*, 4.
Dillon Estate—Purchasing Occupiers failing to pay instalments of Purchase Money, etc., *Nov. 4*, 75.
London Water Bill — Remuneration o Commissioners *Nov. 7*, 385.

Colonial Conference
British Indian Subjects' Disabilities i the Colonies, Omission to discuss.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov 1* 554.

[*cont.*

Colonial Conference—*cont.*
India, Non-Representation of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 511; Lord G. Hamilton, 517.
Speeches of the Colonial Premiers, Omission from the Blue Book.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 267.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State — Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain.
Parliamentary Secretary — Earl of Onslow.

Colonies
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 10*, 449.
British Indian Subjects, Disabilities of—Retaliatory Legislation by the Indian Administration, proposed.
O. Sir. M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 534, 555.
Import Duties—Return Presented, *Nov. 13*, 857; *Nov. 17*, 1097.
Patent Laws, Fees—Return proposed.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 586.
Trading Companies, Parliamentary and Municipal Representation — Circular Despatch Presented, *Nov, 5*, 130; *Nov. 10*, 449.

Commerce, Minister of
Appointment, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 882.

Committees
"Fishing" Inquiry, Harm done by Committee appointed for.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 571.

Companies
Winding Up—Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 14*, 1033; *Nov. 17*, 1098.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Dillon Estate, *see* that title.
Subsidy to Clyde Company, Cork—Injury to Trade of the Port of Limerick, alleged.
Q. *Nov, 12*, 752.

Congested Districts, Scotland
Population, Valuation, etc. — Granting Return.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 11.

Congested Districts Board, Scotland
Applecross—Construction of Road and Bridge, Refusal of the Board to provide Grant-in-Aid.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 749.
Lewis, Island of—
  Destitution among Cottars and Fishermen, Acquisition of Land by the Board, proposed.
  Qs. *Nov. 5*, 142; *Nov. 17*, 1108.
  Poultry Breeding—Number of Sittings of Eggs supplied.
  Q. *Nov. 19*, 1348.
Roads in Mid-Ross, Construction of—Insufficiency of Grant, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 748.

Congo, French
Concessionaire Companies, Exclusive Rights of Proprietorship and Trade, Effect on Interests of British Traders—Representations to the French Government, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Consolidated Fund Acts
Purpose of—Subordination to the Appropriation Act.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 89.

Consolidated Fund [Appropriation] Act
Constitutional Importance as Check upon Ministers, Sole Guarantee of Parliamentary Control of National Finances, etc.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 87, 88, 89, 90.

Consolidation Fund [Appropriation] Bill
Examination of by the First Lord of the Treasury, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 469.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) **Bill**
c. 1R*, *Nov. 6*, 349.
2R, *Nov. 10*, 575.
com., *Nov. 12*, 851.
3R, *Nov. 17*, 1467.

Consolidated Fund [Appropriation] (No. 2) **Bill**
Form of Bill, Absence of Schedule, etc.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Nov. 10*, 575; Mr. Dalziel, 576; Mr. Hayes-Fisher, 577.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
Athlone Barracks, Outbreak of Fever—Cost of Medical Attendance at the Fever Hospital, Refusal of Inspector-General to pay, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 455.
Bagnalstown — Constabulary claiming right to serve Petty Sessions Summonses in Cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1361.
Belfast.
  Lindsay, H., Arrest of—Magistrates characterising Arrest as an error of judgment.
  Q. *Nov. 17*, 1125.
  Number of Police Barracks, etc.
  Q. *Nov. 13*, 879.
Dungannon—Expenses of Extra Police.
Q, *Nov. 17*, 1114.
Monaghan—Number of Constables doing Town Duty, Religious Denominations, etc.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 13.
O'Donnell, J.—Refusal of Admission as Recruit.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 145.
Rathcormac — Gaelic Tournament, Intrusion of the Police.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1350.

[*cont.*

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
Thomastown Guardians' Complaints as to action of District Inspector Fleming.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1363.
Tyson's, District Inspector, alleged Speech denouncing Freemasonry.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 14.

Consular Service
See Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Consumption
Cornish Miners, Health of—Nature of Home Office Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 133.
Ireland, Spread of Consumption—Provision of Sanatoria
Q. *Nov. 13*, 866.

Contracts
See titles, Army, Navy, etc.

Convicts
Conditional Licence Granted — Copy Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1225, 1227.
Muldowney, Michael, Imprisonment for Complicity in the Craughwell Murder —Date of Release.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1238.

Coonagh
Finch's, Col., Property—Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 12.

Co-operative Societies
Dividends and Profits, Payment of Income Tax on.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1242.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Ireland.
National School Teachers' Salaries, Monthly Payment proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1127.
Rock Angus, Lighting proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1127.

Cornwall, County of
Census Return Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1346.
Phthisis among Miners, Nature of Home Office Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 133.

Coronation
Indian Celebrations, etc., *see* India.

Cottage Homes
Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children accommodated, Cost per head per annum, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 261.

Cottages
District Councils, Restrictive Bye-Laws on Erection of Cottages.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 872.
Labourers' Cottages, Ireland, *see* that title.

Cotton Industry
India, *see* that title.

Cotton, Sir H.
Assam Tea Coolies, Statutory Wage, Drink Question, etc., View on.
Os. Earl Percy, *Nov. 10*, 541, 542, 549.

Coulter, R.
Discharging Firearms on Public Road near Silverbridge—Prosecution.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

Countesthorpe School Board
Herbert's, Mr. W. H., Complaint of Child being expelled from Board School with object of compelling attendance at Church of England School, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 875.

County Boroughs, Ireland
Rateable Value, Borrowing Powers, Amount Borrowed, and Amount of Loans repaid—Return Ordered, *Nov. 14*, 1034.

County Councils
Government Departmental Powers, Transfer of County Councils—Provisions of Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 272.

Court-houses, Ireland
Maintenance of Court-houses, Number of County Councils refusing to vote Money.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1128
Use by District Councils, Number of Refusals.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 879.

Cranborne, Viscount, *Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Rochester]
Africa, East—British Protectorates, Conditions of Land Grants, *Nov. 13*, 872.
China—British Influence in the Yangtsze Valley, *Nov. 4*, 7.
Congo, French—Concessionaire Companies, Exclusive Trading Rights, Effect on Interests of British Traders, *Nov. 19*, 1357.
Jerusalem—British Residents' Complaints as to treatment by the Consulate, *Nov. 11*, 593.
Macedonia—Reforms, Attitude of the Powers—Bulgarian Prime Minister's Statement, *Nov. 6*, 271.
Morocco—Kabyle Revolt, Steps taken to protect British Interests, *Nov. 19*, 1357.
Rumbold, Sir H.—Publication of Reminiscences, *Nov. 13*, 871.
Somaliland Campaign—British Troops Conveyed to Berbera in subsidised German Steamer "Bundesrath," *Nov. 10*, 458.
Sugar Bounties Convention—Communications from the Belgian Government, Extension of time for Ratification, etc., *Nov. 6*, 270.

[*cont.*

Cranborne, Viscount—*cont.*
Uganda Railway.
Provision of Further Funds, *Nov. 11*, 594.
Rates on Articles taken by Passengers, *Nov. 18*, 1241.

Craughwell Murder
Muldowney, Michael, Imprisonment for Complicity in—Date of Release.
Q. Nov. 18, 1238.

"Cressy," H.M.S.
Speed Trials—Report.
Q. Nov. 19, 1356.

Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887.
Administration of—Revival of Coercion. Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances—Special Facilities during the Autumn Sitting.
Q. Nov. 4, 14.
Calderwood *v.* M'Curdy, Police Evidence at Quarter Sessions — Proceedings under the Act proposed.
Q. Nov. 6, 276.
Closure by Compartments of Proceedings in Committee.
Observations on the Motion for Closuring Proceedings on the Education Bill, Nov. 11, 609, 710.
Imprisonment of Irish Members of Parliament—Permission to receive Parliamentary Papers, etc., Modification of Prison Rules, proposed.
Qs. Nov. 19, 1364.

Crimes and Outrages, Ireland
Agrarian Outrages—Return Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 10*, 449.
Malicious Injuries, Compensation for—Case of Mr. R. Sproule.
Q. Nov. 6, 274.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 809, 810; *Nov. 17*, 1151, 1152.

Crofters and Cottars
Lewis, Island of—Destitution among Cottars and Fishermen, Acquisition of Land by Congested Districts Board, proposed.
Qs. Nov. 5, 142; *Nov. 17*, 1108.

Cross, Lord
Indian Salt Tax, Objections to increasing.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 495.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
Basic Slag, Importation of—Proceedings against Agent, Protection for Farmers, etc., *Nov. 4*, 3.
Cunard Company, Government Agreement with—Date of Presentation, *Nov. 11*, 601.
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Opportunity for Discussion, *Nov. 11*, 600.

Crowland and District
Light Railways Amendment Order, Presented, *Nov. 10*, 451; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Crown Property, Scotland
Income Tax Arrears — Steps taken to recover.
Q. Nov. 14, 1036.

Cunard Company
Government Agreement with.
Boilers in new Vessels, Type of.
Q. Nov. 5, 132.
Date of Presentation of Agreement.
Q. Nov. 11, 601.

Currency
India, *see* that title.

Curry, Rev. J.
Drogheda—Head Teacher of St. Mary's National School losing £50 a year owing to New Rules, Complaint.
Qs. Nov. 5, 147; *Nov. 13*, 879.

Curzon, Lord
see India.

Custom House, Dublin
Nuns begging Alms, alleged.
Q. Nov. 4, 13.

Customs Boatmen
Grievances—Inquiry.
Q. Nov. 12, 744.

Customs Duties
Colonial Import Duties—Return, Presented. *Nov. 13*, 857; *Nov. 17*, 1097.
Zanzibar—Convention between United Kingdom and the United States, Presented, *Nov. 13*, 857.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Nov. 11*, 603.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Nov. 10*, 575, 577; *com. Nov. 12*, 852, 854, 855
Education, Board of—Permanent Secretary, Retirement of Sir G. Kekewich, *Nov. 10*, 467.
Indian Budget Debate, Continuing at evening sittings, *Nov. 10*, 469.
Militia and Yeomanry Bill, 2R., *Nov. 10*, 579, 580.
South African Shipping Combine—Notification of increase in Freight Rates, Powers of the Board of Trade to intervene, *Nov. 10*, 460.

Darbhanga, Maharaja of
Indian Railway Construction — Private enterprise in construction of Feeder Lines and Government Red-tape.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 498.

Dartmouth
Sunday Trading Prosecution of Mr. J. Scannell.
Q. Nov. 17, 1121.

Davey, Lord
  Patent Law Amendment Bill, 2R., *Nov. 17*, 1101.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]
  Carmarthen—Population as given in the last Census, *Nov. 10*, 454.
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 17*, 1468.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 819.
  Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Grant-in-Aid, *Nov. 6*, 348.

Deaf and Dumb Persons
  Ireland—Maintenance of Deaf and Dumb as an Imperial Charge, proposed. *Q. Nov. 4*, 12.

Deer Forests, Scotland
  Ben Wyvis, Converting Grazings on Southern Slope into Deer Forest—Securing Grazings for Crofters' Holdings, proposed. *Q. Nov. 5*, 142.
  Glastullich Farm, Adding to Rhidorroch Deer Forest—Preventing Land suitable for occupation being added to Forests, Legislation proposed. *Q. Nov. 4*, 10.

Denny, Col. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 18*, 1251.
  Pencils, Use of Foreign-made Pencils in Government Offices—Orders to Home Manufacturers, proposed, *Nov. 5*, 143
  Somaliland Campaign — British Troops conveyed to Berbera in subsidised German steamer "Bundesrath," *Nov. 10*, 457.

Denton, Private
  Reservist Pay Arrears. *Q. Nov. 11*, 591.

Designs
  Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents Rules, Presented, *Nov. 5*, 129; *Nov. 17*, 1098.

Devon
  Plymtree Schoolroom, Refusal of use for Political Meetings — Withdrawal of Parliamentary Grant, proposed. *Q. Nov. 18*, 1236, 1237.

Dewar, Sir T. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
  Telephones, Post Office System—Amount expended, Number of Subscribers, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1359.

"Diadem," H.M.S.
  Boiler Repairs, Date of Completion, etc. *Q. Nov. 17*, 1118.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts, Chippenham]
  Street Traffic in London — Royal Commission, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 759.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
  Afghanistan and Russia—Direct Communication from the Russian Government to the Amir, alleged, *Nov. 13*, 868.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 15, 75, 117; *Nov. 5*, 152, 153, 161, 175; *Nov. 6*, 306, 307, 314; *Nov. 7*, 417, 428; *Nov. 12*, 762; *Nov. 13*, 888, 905, 916, 925, 926, 935, 939, 962; *Nov. 17*, 1146, 1152, 1161, 1166. 1179; *Nov. 18*, 1295; *Nov. 19*, 1375, 1376, 1420.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill.
    Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 723.
    Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1132.
    Grant - in - Aid Clause, Government Changes in, *Nov. 14*, 1037.
    School Buildings — Denominational Schools leased to School Boards, Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as Denominational Schools, *Nov. 5*, 150.
  India.
    Army, British Government Proposals of Feb., 1902—Observations of the Viceroy, etc., Date of circulating Papers, *Nov 4*, 7.
    Responsibility of the House of Commons for the Affairs of India, Non-representation of India at the Colonial Conference, Evils of the Salt Tax, etc., *Nov. 10*, 507.
  Navy, Armour for Cruisers of 1901 Programme, Date of placing Orders, *Nov. 4*, 6.
  South African War—Medals for Transport Officers, *Nov. 17*, 1105.

Dillon Estate, Ireland
  Drainage Operations—Damage to Lough Gara Eel Fishery, alleged. *Q. Nov. 11*, 597.
  Purchasing Occupiers failing to pay Instalments of Purchase Money, etc. *Q. Nov. 4*, 5.
  Sale of Mansion, Advertisement of—Private Offers declined, alleged. *Q. Nov 6*, 276.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
  Committee on Consular Service.
    Distribution of the Consular Service —Referring to Committee proposed. *Q. Nov. 10*, 452.
    Names of Members, etc. *Q. Nov. 13*, 862.
  Jerusalem—British Residents' Complaints as to Treatment by the Consulate. *Q. Nov. 11*, 593.

Diseases of Animals
  Foot and Mouth Disease—Estimated loss incurred by Farmers through importation of Cattle from Abroad. *Q. Nov. 6*, 272.
  Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1098, 1104.

Dispensary Medical Officers
See Medical Officers, Ireland.

District Councils
Building Bye-Laws, Restrictions on erection of Cottages
Q. *Nov. 13*, 872.
Ireland.
Courthouses, Use of by District Councils—Number of Refusals
Q. *Nov. 13*, 879.
Elections — Re-elected Councillors acting as paid Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks at contested Elections in Roscommon.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1124.

Donegal
Londonderry and Donegal Union Boundaries, Change in—Date of Local Government Board Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 877.

Wreckage off the Coast—Steps taken to remove.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 289, 302; *Nov. 13*, 915, 932; *Nov. 19*, 1442.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum—Patient inflicting Injuries on Attendant, Precautions, *Nov. 17*, 1121.
Lewes Guy Fawkes Celebration—Insults to Roman Catholics, alleged, *Nov. 10*, 459.
Police—Perjury, Case of ex-Constable Rolls, Dismissal of Second Constable from Force, *Nov. 4*, 8.
Sunday Trading—Enforcing Lord's Day Observance Act against Publicans, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1121, 1122.

Doyle, Mary
Sneem Licensing Case—Police opposing Licence of Mary Doyle, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Drogheda
St. Mary's National School, Head Teacher losing £50 a year owing to Commissioners' Interpretation of New Rules.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 147; *Nov. 13*, 879.

Dublin
Custom House, Nuns begging Alms, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 13.
Four Courts, Delays in cases pending Trial.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 862.

Dublin—*cont.*
Post Office.
Officers employed on Split Duties not having nine hours at home.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 130.
Sanitary Authority.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 131.
Triple Attendance, Overtime Payments.
Q. *Nov. 5*. 130.
Vacancies in Sorting Office Staff—Date of filling up.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 260.
Recorder's Court, Accumulation of Cases—Extending Jurisdiction of Court of Conscience, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1362.
Trawling in Dublin Bay—Destruction of line fishing.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
Imprisonment of, under the Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—Communication to the Speaker, *Nov. 17*, 1103.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 54; *Nov. 12*, 817, 818.

Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* *Nov. 17*, 1099.
Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Duncan, Mr. J. H. [Yorks, W.R., Otley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 18*, 1245.
Provided Schools, *Nov. 17*, 1123.

Dungannon
Police—Expenses of extra Police.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1114.

Dutt, Mr. Romesh
Land Assessment in India—Over Assessment the Cause of Distress and Famine—Mr. Dutt's Allegations.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 478.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. [Kent, Dartford]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 823, 826.

Eade, Henry
Thames Ironworks Level Crossing—Fatal Accident to Henry Eade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Edgeworthstown
Postmastership — Name, Salary, and Nationality of Telegraphist appointed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 259.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Education

- Countesthorpe — Mr. W. H. Herbert's Complaint of Child being expelled from Board School with object of compelling attendance at Church of England School, alleged. *Q.* *Nov. 13*, 875.
- Fees—Number of Schools charging Fees, Amount received, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 17*, 1123.
- Inspectors—Mr. H. M. Richards, Experience in Elementary Schools. *Q.* *Nov. 13*, 859.
- Ireland.
  - Drogheda — St. Mary's National School, Head Teacher losing £50 a year owing to Commissioners' interpretation of New Rules. *Q.* *Nov. 5*, 147; *Nov. 13*, 879.
  - Intermediate Education, Examinations for 1903—Rule Presented *Nov. 14*, 1033.
  - Irish Language — Appointment of Inspectors capable of examining Pupils in Irish, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 17*, 1129.
  - National School Teachers, *see* that title.
  - Starkie's, Dr., Statements against Primary School Managers — Roman Catholic Managers' Resolutions, etc. *Qs.* *Nov. 5*, 147; *Nov. 12*, 752.
  - University Education, Royal Commission—Date of Report. *Q.* *Nov. 17*, 1129.
- Plymtree Schoolroom, Refusal of use for Political Meetings — Withdrawal of Parliamentary Grant, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 18*, 1236, 1237.
- Ritualistic Practices at St. John's Church Day Schools, Sutton-on-Plym—Case of Alice Keates. *Q.* *Nov. 18*, 1236.
- Scotland—Tolsta School, Number of Pupils—Cause of temporary closing of School, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 13*, 874.
- School Buildings—Regulations for Denominational Schools transferred to School Boards to which Building Grants have been made. *Q.* *Nov. 4*, 9.
- Schoolmasters' Houses.
  - Amount of Grants made since 1843. *Q.* *Nov. 13*, 858.
  - Grants for, 1843-1881, Copy Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1345.
- Secondary and Technical Education, *see* that title.
- Voluntary Schools — Rebuilding Southwark Schools, Application of Money from City Parochial Charities Fund. *Q.* *Nov. 13*, 874.

Education, Board of

- *President*—Marquess of Londonderry.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Sir W. Anson.
- Permanent Secretary—Retirement of Sir G. Kekewich and Appointment of Mr. Morant. *Q.* *Nov. 10*, 467.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

- *c. com.* *Nov. 4*, 15, 115; *Nov. 5*, 151; *Nov. 6*, 277, 349; *Nov. 7*, 386; *Nov. 12*, 761; *Nov. 13*, 883; *Nov. 14*, 1038; *Nov. 17*, 1144; *Nov. 18*, 1243; *Nov. 19*, 1367.

Education (England and Wales) Bill

- Accounts, Audit of Municipal Accounts—Opportunity for consideration of Government Proposals. *Q.* *Nov. 17*. 1106.
- Amendments.
  - Government Amendments, Date of Introduction, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 11*, 587.
  - Number of—Never was a Bill brought into the House which had been so much amended. *Os.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 11*, 649; Mr. J. Ellis, 656; Mr. Asquith, 714.
- Attendance Officers, Security of Tenure—Insertion of Clause in the Bill proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 17*, 1106.
- Cann Hall District, Position of. *Q.* *Nov. 18*, 1230.
- Church, Attitude of.
  - *Church Times*—Criticism of the Government. *O.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Nov. 11*, 666.
  - Origin of the Bill—Church Pressure, alleged. *Os.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Nov. 11*, 625; Mr. J. Ellis, 656; Mr. Lloyd-George 665; Sir W. Holland, 681.
- Closure by Compartments of the remainder of the proceedings in Committee and on Report.
  - *Motion* [Mr. A. J. Balfour] *Nov. 11*, 607—*Amendment* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], 621.
- Committee—Number of Days Spent in discussing Committee Stage of the Bill before the application of the Closure.
  - *References to on the Motion for Closure*, *Nov. 11*, 610, 649.
- Conduct of the Bill—Criticism of the Minister in charge for making a Political Speech outside the House. *O.* Mr. J. Ellis, *Nov. 11*, 657.
- *Debate in Committee* [Commons] *Nov. 4*, 15; *Nov. 5*, 151; *Nov 6*, 277; *Nov. 7*, 386; *Nov. 11*, 607; *Nov. 12*, 761; *Nov. 13*, 883; *Nov. 14*, 1038; *Nov. 17*, 1144; *Nov. 18*, 1243; *Nov. 19*, 1367.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Age Limit for Attendance at Public Elementary Schools.
  Completion of School Year after attaining age of Fifteen, 1060.
  Fifteen Years of Age Limit, Abolition of, proposed, 1059.
  Retention of Pupils beyond the age of Fifteen where there was no provision for Higher Education within the District 1064.
Agricultural Interest as affected by the Finance of the Bill, 667, 802, 804, 807, 814, 816, 820, 826, 827, 828, 1193, 1195.
Amendments closured in pursuance of the Order of 11th November, 967, 971, 975, 979, 987, 989, 993, 999, 1005, 1007, 1017, 1019, 1025, 1080, 1085.
Appeal to the Board of Education in case of dispute between the School Management and the Local Education Authority.
  Education Committee, Constitution of, *see* sub-heading Education Committee, Co-optation and Scheme.
  Endowments, *see* that sub-heading
  Humiliating Position in which the County Councils were placed, alleged, 20, 22.
  Necessary Schools, *see* that sub-heading.
  Supremacy of Local Education Authority in respect o Secular Education done away with by the Board of Education power of Revision, 21.
Board of Education.
  Appeal, *see* sub-headings Appeal, Endowments, Necessary Schools, etc.
  Failure in Duty of Local Education Authority or Managers, Compulsory Powers as against Local Education Authorities—No corresponding power as against Managers of Voluntary Schools, 18, 20, 23.
Boroughs and Urban Districts.
  Education Committee, Establishment of—Position of Smaller Local Authorities, 152–164, 168, 169.
  Number of Scholars in a Necessary School, Objections to the limit of 30 in Urban Areas, 59.
  Rating, *see* sub-heading Finance, Urban Districts.
College—Institutions included in the Term, 1066.
Control — Popular Control by the Local Education Authority as representing the Ratepayers.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Control—*cont.*
  County Councils, attitude of—Power of administering the Bill, etc., 23, 306, 310, 777.
  Secular Education, Control of, by the Local Education Authority done away with by the Right of Appeal, 21.
County Councils, Attitude of—Power of administering the Bill, Overwork, etc, 23, 306, 310, 777.
Education Committee.
  Appointment of Committee to be Optional, 165–171, 209.
  Authority Constituting, Any Council in the exercise of its powers under this Act—Local Education Authority to be the only Authority having power to establish an Education Committee, proposed, 151, 155–164.
  Boroughs and Urban Districts, Position of Local Authorities in smaller areas, 152–164, 168, 169.
  Constitution of Committee.
    Aldermen, Exclusion of, except as Co-opted Members, 314.
    Bills of 1890, 1896, and 1901, Provisions of, 324.
    London County Council Illustration, 401.
    Majority of Members to be chosen by the Council, and from members of its own body, unless specially determined otherwise, 157, 158, 186, 304–307, 309–314.
    Members of Committee to be also Members of the Council unless the Council shall otherwise determine, 308–314.
    Option of Local Education Authority that majority of Members of Committee should also be Members of the Council, Abolition of, proposed, 317–330.
  Consultative Committee to whom all matters shall stand referred and the Council shall consider the Report (if any) before proceeding on the matter in question, 156, 278–303.
    Definition of "stand referred," 281.
    Discretionary Power of Reference for Local Education Authority, except in Financial Matters, 285–289.

[*cont.*

Education (**England and Wales**) **Bill**—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Education Committee—*cont.*
Consultative Committee, etc.—*cont.*
Local Education Authority deprived of the Power of dealing with any Educational Question, except through the Education Committee, 294, 774, 777.
Matter to be within the Official Knowledge of the Council before being referred to the Committee, proposed, 286, 288-294.
Raising a Rate or Borrowing Money excepted, 281-284.
Co-optation of Members—Nomination of Experts by Other Bodies, etc., 195-198, 401, 774, 776, 780, 784, 789.
Attitude of Local Authorities, 399, 401.
Board of Education, Position of, 351-354, 398.
Definition of "Other Bodies" and "Persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of Schools in the Area," 334, 337, 349, 353, 785.
Educational Institutions in or near the District . . . . Universities, etc. — Substituting for Other Bodies, 391-406.
Expert, Failure of, in Elementary Education, alleged, 357.
Rural District Councils, Specific Inclusion among Bodies which should nominate persons to serve on the Education Committee, 386-390.
Sectarian Element, Introduction of—Objections to any Section of Members being regarded as fighting the battles of Extraneous Bodies, etc., 333-338, 349-359, 391-406.
Selection by the Local Education Authority of Persons to be co-opted, Substituting for Nomination by a Society, 359-372.
Zurich Educational System, 363, 364, 400.
County Authority, No provision for Representation on Committees of Subsidiary Authorities, 791.
Delay which would be caused by necessity of reporting all details—Powers of Delegation required, etc., 300-303.

Education (**England and Wales**) **Bill**—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Education Committee—*cont.*
Delegation of Local Education Authority's Powers to the Education Committee without Restriction, except power of raising a Rate or borrowing Money, 156, 157, 278, 281, 282, 300-303, 305.
Disqualification of Members, 433-438.
Meetings.
Intervals at which County Committees would sit, 298, 299.
Meetings and Proceedings to to be subject to the same Provisions and Regulations which affect ordinary Committees of any Council, 761-764.
Plural Committees within one Area, Objections to, Retention of existing division between Elementary and Secondary Education, etc., 171, 181.
Ratepayers resident in the Locality—Necessary Qualification for Two-thirds of the Persons appointed by the Council, 415-420.
Reports — Despatch in making Reports, 297.
Scheme to be made by the Local Education Authority and approved by the Board of Education, 194, 775.
Abolition of Appeal to the Board of Education, 193-206.
Board of Education to make a Scheme by Provisional Order if the Scheme of the Local Education Authority was not approved, 199-204, 781.
Inquiry by the Board of Education before approving a Scheme, 202, 203, 775, 776.
Policy of the Board of Education, 790.
School Accommodation, Failure to provide — Possibility of Procedure by *Mandamus*, 116.
School Boards.
Representation of, in Wales, 787.
School Boards existing at the time of the passing of the Act, Appointment of Members as Members of the First Committee, 438-440.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Education Committee—*cont.*
Status, etc., of the Education Committee, 783, 784.
Technical Instruction Committees of County and Borough Councils, Success of, 199, 204.
Term of holding Office, Time-limit of Three Years, 182–189.
Bill of 1896, Provisions of, 169, 182.
Trades Unions and Co-operative Associations, Representation of, 404, 405.
Travelling Expenses of Members of the Education Committee, Payment of, 833–851.
Urgent Matters, Power for Local Authority to act without waiting for the Report of the Committee, 299.
Wales and Monmouthshire, County Governing Bodies constituted under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, Abolition of, and Transfer of Powers to the Local Education Authority, 765–773.
Women, Inclusion among Members of the Committee, 423–432.
Endowments — Disposal of Income from Endowments, Allocation between Managers and Local Education Authority, 1199–1218, 1221, 1243–1256.
Alteration of Trust Deeds, Prohibiting Alteration later than dates proposed, 1260, 1437.
Board of Education Decision with reference to Trust Deeds in Case of Dispute.
Board of Education to have regard to the proportion in which the whole Cost of the School is borne by the Education Authority and the Managers, 1323.
Costs of Inquiry, Payment of, 1311–1320.
Decision not to be given until after Local Inquiry, of which Ten Days' Public Notice must be given, 1305–1315.
Extension of Clause to all Educational Endowments, 1299.
Maintenance of a School as an Institution, Withdrawal of Endowment from Discretion of Trustees, Interpretation of "Maintenance," 1289–1297.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Endowments —*cont.*
"Original Trusts," Substituting for "Trusts or other Provisions," 1267–1274.
Religious Instruction — Limiting portion of Income from Endowment paid to Managers to Religious or Sectarian Purposes of Endowment, 1281–1286.
Surplus of Endowments, Application to Educational Purposes instead of relieving the Rates, 1329.
Trust Deeds in general terms, Discretion for County Authority as well as Trustees, 1277.
Evening Schools, Definition of all Instruction given in, as Higher Education—Elementary Teaching in Evening Schools, etc., 1038–1057.
Finance of the Bill.
Agricultural Interest as affected by the Bill, Position of, 667, 802, 804, 807, 814, 816, 820, 826, 827, 828, 1193, 1195.
Aid-grant of 4s. per Scholar, with an additional 1½d. per Scholar for every complete 2d., etc., 1144, 1187–1199.
Amalgamated Parishes, Hardship on, alleged, 1179.
Fixed Scale of 2s., Sliding Scale of 2d., proposed, 1148.
Local Education Authority not being a County Borough, Calculation of 1d. Rate on Assessment for County Rates, 1169.
Local Obligation, Standard of —3d. Rate Proposal, Parliamentary Grant to be regulated by amount of Local contributions, etc., 1150, 1152, 1172, 1189.
London, Position of, with reference to the Aid-grant, 1140.
Necessitous School Board Districts, Position of, 1155–1163.
Parish to be the Unit for Financial Purposes instead of the County, proposed, 1165.
Sectarian Endowment, Protest against Policy of, 1331–1140.
Sliding Scale, Allocation of the whole Grant by Sliding Scale, 1163.
Audit, Re-introduction of, 1214, 1215, 1218.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Finance of the Bill—*cont.*
Borough Rate—Separate Rate for Education to be made in the same manner as the Borough Rate, if no Borough Rate is levied, 907.
Estimate of Expenses under the Act—Distinguishing Amount Expended on Provided and Non-Provided Schools, 913–918.
Expenditure out of the Rates not to exceed one-fourth of the whole Expenditure on Education by the Education Authority, 797–831.
Increase in the Grant, Government Hopes, 803.
Poor Rate—Education Rate to be levied on the basis of Assessment for the Poor Rate, 901–907.
Rating Power and Power of Borrowing Money could not be delegated by the Local Education Authority, 156, 157.
School Buildings for Elementary Education.
Existing Schools, Liabilities of—Equality of Treatment with New Schools, Position of Necessitous School Board Districts, 960, 1156–1161.
Provision of—Objections to Localisation of Capital Expenditure, Placing the cost of New Buildings upon the County Rate, proposed, 939-944, 947–956, 959.
Secondary and Technical Education, Localisation of Charges Proposal, Objections to—Putting all expenses of Higher Education on the County Rate, 921–935.
Limiting power of Differentiation to Capital Expenditure, 933, 935.
Urban Districts.
County Council not to levy a Rate within any Urban District the Council of which is the Education Authority for Elementary Education, and which has levied a Rate for Education other than Elementary, 909–912.
Expenses, Raising out of the Poor Rate, 908.
Labour Representation on the Education Committees—Exclusion of Working Men on the ground of Expense, Payment of Travelling Expenses of Members, 831-851, 883–899.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Local Education Authority.
Delegation of Powers without Restrictions, with the exception of the Power of Raising a Rate or Borrowing Money, 156, 157.
Education Committee, *see* that sub-heading.
Mandamus, *see* that sub-heading.
Minor Local Authority, Meaning of term, 1065.
Secular Education, Control of, by the Local Authority done away with by the Board of Education Power of Revision, 21.
Managers of Voluntary Schools.
Board of Management, Constitution of, 1367–1462.
Clerical representation, limiting to one Member, 1449.
Order, application for, notice, etc., 1457–1465.
Parents, Representation of, 1391–1430.
Residential qualification, 1445.
Tenure of Office, 1433.
Failure in Duty—Board of Education unable to compel carrying out of an obligation, 18, 20, 23.
Mandamus, Application of, 23, 24.
School Accommodation, Offer of, by "other Persons" than the Local Education Authority—Power for Board of Education to compel carrying out of Proposals, 74-76, 119–122.
Mandamus—Remedy provided in case of Failure in Duty on the part of the Local Authority, 799.
Equal Treatment for Managers and Local Education Authority, 23, 24, 74–76.
School Accommodation, Failure to provide necessary Additional Accommodation, 72-74, 115–122.
Secondary Education—Board of Education power to enforce Orders by *Mandamus*, 799.
Necessary Schools.
Appeal to the Board of Education in case of dispute whether a School was necessary or not.
Conditions to be regarded in determining a controversy [Interests of Secular Education, Wishes of Parents, Economy of the Rates]—Omission of Conditions, Inducement to decide in favour of Managers, etc., 16-34.
Settlement of, without Unnecessary Delay, 15.

[*cont.*

- **Education (England and Wales) Bill**—*cont.*
  - *Debate in Committee—cont.*
    - Necessary Schools—*cont.*
      - Number of Scholars—limit of 30, 53.
        - Higher limit, substituting 100, proposed, 55, 60.
      - Public Elementary School, Insertion of proviso which would exclude unauthorised Schools, proposed, 30–34, 43.
      - Schools actually in Existence.
        - "Already recognised as a Public Elementary School"—Substituted for "Actually in Existence," 55.
        - Definition of, 17.
        - "Existing at the date of the passing of this Act"—Substituting for "Actually in Existence," proposed, 44–55.
    - Necessitous School Board Districts, Position of under the new Aid-Grant, 1155–1163.
    - Night School Work, Definition of All Night School Work as Higher Education—Elementary Instruction given in Evening Schools, etc., 1038, 1057.
    - Population, Test of—Census of 1901 until superseded by any future Census, proposed, 1071.
    - Public Elementary School, Insertion of proviso which would exclude establishment of unauthorised Schools after the passing of the Bill, 30–34, 43.
    - Pupil Teachers, Question of excluding from Secondary Schools, 1057.
    - Roman Catholic Schools—Representation on Education Committee, 393, 395, 396, 400.
    - Rural District Councils — Bodies which should nominate Persons to serve on the Education Committee, Specific inclusion of Rural District Councils, 386–390.
    - School Accommodation.
      - Amalgamation of Small Schools, Collection of Pupils by Public Conveyance, etc., 56, 58.
      - Necessary Schools, *see* that sub-heading.
      - Provision of New Schools.
        - Capital Expenditure, Localisation of—Placing cost of New Schools upon the County Rate, Discretionary Power for County Authority, etc., 939–944, 947–956, 959.
        - Failure in duty on the part of the Local Education Authority—Procedure by *Mandamus*, 72–74, 115–122.

- **Education (England and Wales) Bill** -*cont.*
  - *Debate in Committee—cont.*
    - School Accommodation—*cont.*
      - Provision of New Schools—*cont.*
        - Multiplication of Small Schools, Evils of, 45, 46
        - Other Persons than the local Authority, Offer to provide School Accommodation—Power for Board of Education to compel carrying out of Proposal, 74–76, 119–122.
        - Schools could only be established after the passing of the Bill under sanction provided by Clause 9 and subject to inquiry by the Board, of Education, 23, 51–53.
    - School Buildings.
      - Financial Liabilities of existing Schools.
        - Equality of Treatment with New Schools, 960.
        - Necessitous School Board Districts, Position of, 1155, 1163.
      - Provision of New Schools, *see* sub-heading School Accommodation.
      - Repairs, Funds upon which Managers could draw, 1370, 1371, 1384, 1386.
    - Secondary Education.
      - Board of Education, Power to enforce orders by *Mandamus*, 799.
      - Definition of all Night School Work as Higher Education—Elementary Instruction in Evening Schools, 1038, 1057.
      - Expenses—Localisation of Charges Proposal, Putting all Expenses of Higher Education on the County Rate, 921–935.
      - Position of—Provision for Expenses of Secondary Education, Sources, etc., 797.
      - Secular Education, Control of, by the Local Education Authority done away with by the Board of Education Power of Revision, 21.
    - Teachers.
      - Pupil Teachers — Secondary Schools, Question of excluding Pupil Teachers, 1057.
      - Training of Teachers, Cost of—Provision of Expenses from the Rates Proposal, 798, 809.
    - Travelling Expenses.
      - Education Committee, Members of—Payment of Travelling Expenses, 833–851.
      - Teachers or Children, Provision of Vehicles or payment of Travelling Expenses by the Local Education Authority where required by conditions of District, 1066.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

Debate in Committee—cont.

Trust Deeds, Allocation of Income from Endowment, *see* sub-heading Endowments.

Urban Districts, *see* sub-headings Boroughs and Urban Districts, and Finance.

Welsh Intermediate Education Act.

County Governing Bodies constituted under the Act of 1889 to be the Education Committee—Abolition of County Governing Bodies and Transfer of Power to the Local Education Authority, 765-773.

Travelling Expenses of Members of Central Board, Payment of, 885, 887.

Women, Inclusion among Members of the Education Committee, 423, 432.

Education Committee.

Contracts with School Boards, Position of Members interested in.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 860.

Co-opted Members — Definition of "Other Bodies."
Q. *Nov. 10*, 454.

Delegation of Work to Local Committees.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1230.

Spending Powers of Education Committees.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 143.

Endowments.

Allocation of Undenominational Endowments.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 587.

Endowments administered under a Charity Commission Scheme.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Trust Deeds—Preventing Execution of Sham Trust Deeds.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Evening Continuation Schools—Powers of Local Authorities, Interpretation of Clause 2.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1346.

Evening Elementary Schools, Provision of.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1360.

Finance of the Bill.

Agricultural Grant—Payment to each Parish by County Councils.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1228.

Expenses of Local Education Authorities—Loan Expenses.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1034.

Grant-in-Aid Clause, Government Changes in, Effect of.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1037.

Grants to Local Education Authorities—Committee to consider of authorising payment (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *Nov. 12*, 761.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

Finance of the Bill—*cont.*

Penny Rate, Product of.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 881.

Financial Resolution, *Nov. 14*, 1091; *Nov. 17*, 1131.

Legislation for a Minority, alleged.
O. Sir J. Leese, *Nov. 11*, 669.

Managers, Appointment in Voluntary Schools.

Cases where there are no Foundation Managers or where the School Buildings are the private property of Individuals.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1229.

Number of Managers under the Trust Deeds of the School, Assimilating to Number required by the Act.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1229.

Mandate, Doctrine of—No Mandate to deal with Education, alleged.

Observations on the Motion for Closure by Compartments, Nov. 11, 627, 648, 653, 661, 662, 699.

Opposition to the Bill—Attitude of the Country, Strength of Nonconformist Feeling, etc.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Nov. 11*, 628; Mr. Tomkinson, 674; Sir W. Holland, 682.

Outrageous Bill.

O. Mr. Broadhurst, *Nov. 11*, 671.

Origin of the Bill—Demand of the Church Party.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Nov. 11*, 625; Mr. J. Ellis, 656; Mr. Lloyd-George, 665; Sir W. Holland, 681.

Provided Schools—Treatment of Undenominational Schools which have become Denominational by connivance of Trustees.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1123.

Religious Instruction Appeals—Managers' Decisions subjected to appeal to episcopal authority where Trust Deeds provide for it.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1365.

"School" in Clause 15 (a), Definition of.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 860.

School Buildings.

Alterations and Improvements—Responsibility of Managers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1229.

Denominational Schools leased to School Boards.

Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as a Denominational School.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 149; *Nov. 13* 876.

Transfer to School Boards, Preventing re-transfer to Managers.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1130.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
School Buildings—*cont.*
Rent-free Buildings — Payment of Ground-rent.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 453.
"Repairs"—Definition of Term.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1229.
Requirements of the Educational Authority—Form of Agreement.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1229.
Teachers.
Membership of Municipal Bodies — Question of.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 266.
Organising Teachers, Status of.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 134.
Teachers' Houses—Public Claim to use of Houses jointly with School Trustees.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 858.
Trust Deeds, *see* sub-heading Endowments.
Voluntary Schools.
Credit Balances in hands of Managers, Appropriation of.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 860.
Non-Aided Church Schools, Position of.
Q. *Nov.* 10, 452.
Welsh Intermediate Education—County Councils' Powers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1361.

Eel Fishery at Lough Gara
Proprietor suffering Loss owing to Floods caused by Dillon Estate Drainage Operations, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 597.

Egypt
Hasheesh, Prohibition of Sale.
O. Mr. Caine, *Nov. 10*, 536.

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill
c. Intro. and 1R., *Nov. 12*, 760.
2R.*, *Nov. 18*, 1344.

Elibank, Master of [Edinburgh, Midlothian]
Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Grant in Aid—Allocation, Question of acknowledging Boer Requisition Notes, *Nov. 6*, 346, 347.

Elliot, Mr. A. R. D. [Durham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 651.
India—Disabilities of "Purdanishins," Permitting Women to qualify as Legal Advisers, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 458.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 614, 654, 693, 699.
New Palace Yard, etc., Improvement in Lighting Arrangements.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Education (England and Wales Bill), *com.* *Nov. 5*, 167; *Nov. 6*, 309; *Nov. 7*, 397, 436; *Nov. 13*, 908, 928; *Nov. 14*, 1056; *Nov. 17*, 1163; *Nov. 19*, 1399, 1452.
India—Financial Condition, Effect of Currency Changes on Commerce, Need for Reduction of Taxation, etc., *Nov. 10*, 557, 570.

Emyvale
Dispensary Medical Officer, Reduction of Salary below sum arranged by Local Authority.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 867.

Erlin, Port
Boat Slip—Arrangements for Construction of.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 759.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 120; *Nov. 5*, 163, 164, 168, 185, 186, 209; *Nov. 6*, 297, 299, 315, 326; *Nov. 7*, 405, 419, 430; *Nov. 12*, 763, 783, 849; *Nov. 13*, 897, 909, 914, 917, 942, 943, 955; *Nov. 14*, 1056, 1072, 1092, 1093, 1094; *Nov. 17*, 1167, 1183, 1210, 1211, 1214, 1217; *Nov. 18*, 1245, 1248, 1260, 1262, 1281, 1293, 1307, 1308, 1312, 1318, 1324, 1325; *Nov. 19*, 1412, 1422, 1440, 1453, 1461, 1466.

Evicted Tenants Act, 1894
Closure by Compartments of Proceedings in Committee.
Observations on the Motion for Closuring Proceedings on the Education Bill, Nov. 11, 609, 711.

Evictions, Ireland
Return of Evictions, Presented, *Nov. 11*, 585.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
c. *com.* and Report,* *Nov. 6*, 379.

Explosives
Pembroke Urban Council Bye-law, Objections to—Local Government Board Sanction.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 466.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Leonard, Sergeant — Degradation to the Ranks for writing to the Secretary of State for War, *Nov. 17*, 1118.

Factories and Workshops Act, 1901
New Regulations, Objections of File-cutting Operatives, etc. — Local Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 862.

Fair Rents, Ireland
Longford and Leitrim, Number of Applications pending — Date of next Sub-Commission Sittings.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

Fair Wage Resolution
Woolwich Arsenal, Wages of Workmen in Danger Buildings—Infringement of Fair Wage Resolution, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 139.

Farquharson, Dr. R. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Army—Proposed Appointment of Special Sanitary Officers, Nature of Duties, *Nov. 10*, 455.

Fellowes, Mr. A. E. [Hunts, Ramsey]
Charing Cross to the Mall, New Street—Date of beginning Work, *Nov. 17*, 1123.
New Palace Yard, etc., Improvement in Lighting Arrangements, *Nov. 11*, 596.
Volunteer Drill in Richmond Park, Government setting apart increased Areas, *Nov. 11*, 595, 596.

Fenwick, Mr.
Explorations in British Honduras—Report to the Colonial Office.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1352.

Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
Education (England and Wales Bill), *com. Nov. 12*, 844.
Telegraph Service Employees—Enforcing Age Retirement, *Nov. 13*, 870.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 13*, 931.

Fertilisers
Basic Slag, Importation of Spurious Slag—Proceedings against Agent, Protection for Farmers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 3.

File-Cutting Operatives
Objections to New Regulations in Factory and Workshops Act, 1901—Local Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 862.

Finance Accounts, National
Expediting Printing and Distribution.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1367.

Financial Secretary to the Treasury
Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Finch's, Col., Coonagh Property
Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 12.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney General* [Inverness Burghs.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 23, 30, 31, 32, 43, 44, 48, 55, 57, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 116; *Nov. 5*, 152, 159, 163, 164, 171, 193, 194, 199, 202, 203; *Nov. 6*, 281, 282, 287, 290, 299, 321, 328, 329, 330, 333, 334, 335, 336; *Nov. 7*, 411, 429; *Nov. 13*, 898, 908, 930, 948; *Nov. 14*, 1057, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1072; *Nov. 17*, 1154, 1164, 1165, 1166, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1176, 1190, 1193, 1194, 1199; *Nov. 18*, 1318; *Nov. 19*, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1410, 1411, 1439, 1447, 1466.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Spending Powers of Committees, *Nov. 5*, 143.
Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, 2R, *Nov. 5*, 254.

Finson, Private A.
Reservist Pay Arrears.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 591.

Firearms, Ireland.
Silverbridge—Revolver fired at Tullyvallen National Band, Prosecution.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

First Commissioner of Works
Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Fisher, Mr. Hayes—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* (Fulham.)
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill, 2R, *Nov. 10*, 577.
Ireland.
Armagh Income Tax Appeals—Holding Sittings at Armagh instead of Portadown, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 758.
Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway, Surplus Profit—Enforcing Section 5 of Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883, *Nov. 13*, 873, 874.
Pencils, Use of Foreign-made Pencils in Government Offices—Orders to Home Manufacturers, proposed, *Nov. 5*, 144.

Fisheries
Ireland.
Fishery Piers—Return Presented, *Nov. 7*, 381.
Gara Lough Eel Fishery—Proprietor suffering loss owing to Floods caused by Dillon Estate Drainage Operations, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 597.
Trawling in Dublin Bay—Destruction of line fishing.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.
North Sea Fisheries Investigation, International Scheme—Contributions of various Countries, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 4*, 8; *Nov. 5*, 135.
Scotland.
Crusiers placed at the disposal of the Fishery Board during withdrawal of the "Jackal."
Q. *Nov. 5*, 143.
Lewis, Island of—Provision of Gunboat to protect Line Fishermen against Trawlers.
Qs. *Nov. 11*, 595; *Nov. 12*, 750.
Trawling—Protection against illegal Trawling, Additional Cruisers.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 11.

Fishery Board, Scotland
McIloy, Mr., Appointment as Member—Qualifications.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 751.

Fitzgerald, Sir R. Penrose [Cambridge]
Army Promotions—Length of Service, Royal Garrison Artillery Grievance, *Nov. 18*, 1233.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. P. [Wilts, Cricklade]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 118; *Nov. 5*, 151, 159, 163, 164, 173, 180; *Nov. 6*, 279; *Nov. 7*, 399, 401; *Nov. 12*, 842: *Nov. 13*, 906, 910, 914, 914, 931; *Nov. 14*, 1058; *Nov. 17*, 1221; *Nov. 18*, 1244.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue [Yorkshire, Shipley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 837; *Nov. 13*, 905.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 723.

Food and Drugs Act Amendment Bill
c. Bill withdrawn, *Nov. 10*, 584.

Foot and Mouth Disease
Loss suffered by Farmers through Importation of Cattle from Abroad.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 272.

Foreign Competition
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Protest against Restriction of Debate.
O. Mr. Broadhurst, *Nov. 11*, 670.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under Secretary—Viscount Cranborne.

Foster, Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 7*, 435; *Nov. 13*, 892; *Nov. 14*, 1047.
Poor Law Village Communities, Names of Unions establishing, Number of Children accommodated, Cost per head per annum, etc., *Nov. 6*, 261.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
Indian Finance, Reduction of Taxation proposed—Cost of entertaining Indian Coronation Guests, Danger of large Surpluses, etc., *Nov. 10*, 491.

France
Congo Concessionaire Companies' Exclusive Rights of Proprietorship and Trade, Effect on Interests of British Traders.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Franchise and Jurors Acts, Ireland
Work under—Transfer of to Clerks of Unions, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 465.

Freemasonry
Tysons, District Inspector, alleged Denunciatory Speech.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 14.

Freight
South African Shipping Lines, Notification of Increase in rate of Freight to Traders—Powers of the Board of Trade to intervene.
Qs. *Nov. 10*, 459, 460.

Friday Sittings of the House
Abstract Motions abandoned owing to elaborate Discussion of Supply.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 516.

Friendly Societies
Dividends and Profits, Payment of Income Tax on.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1242.

"Gael"
Old Steamer employed in Stornoway Mail Service, Speed, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 141; *Nov. 18*, 1235.

Gambling Telegrams
Clerks in receipt of 12s. to 30s. per week, Preventing Employment in transmission of Sporting Telegrams.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 132.
Money Orders containing instructions as to Bets, Preventing use of Telegraph Service for Gambling Transactions.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 131.

Game Licences, Ireland
Evasions of the Law in King's County—Precautions taken to insure compliance with the Law, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1348.

Gara Lough
Eel Fishery—Proprietor suffering loss owing to Floods caused by Dillon Estate Drainage Operations, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 597.

Garrison Regiments
Conduct and Efficiency of—Official Reports.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 746.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

General Election of 1900
Character of—No Mandate to deal with Education.
Observations on the Motion for Closure of the Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Nov. 11*, 627, 648, 653, 661, 662, 699.
Issue upon which the Election was fought.
Os. Mr. Tomkinson, *Nov. 11*, 674; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 700.

Germany
Samoa Dispute, Settlement of Claims by Arbitration, Decision of the King of Sweden and Norway — Convention Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1105 ; *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Gibraltar
Harbour on Eastern Side of the Rock, Engineer's Report—Laying on the Table.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1365.

Glamorgan, County of
Technical Instruction—Minute sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act of 1889 Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1345.

Glasgow
Clyde—Port Local Authority, Corporation Application—Laying Report upon the Table.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1123.

Glasgow University
Degrees of Science in Public Health, University Court Ordinance Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1227.

Glastullich Farm
Adding to Rhidorroch Deer Forest.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 10.

Goddard, Mr. D. F. [Ipswich]
Salisbury Post Office—Appointment of Son of the Postmaster as Telegraphist, *Nov. 6*, 260.

Gokhale, Mr.
Statistics as to Indian Trade—Sir E. Law's Criticism.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 560.

" Good Hope."
Route arranged for Mr. Chamberlain's Tour—Cost of the "Good Hope," etc.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 589.

Gordon, Major Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Jews, Treatment of in Roumania—American Note, Date of Publication of Correspondence, *Nov. 18*, 1231.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University]
Autumn Sittings, Business which may properly be taken at—Sir J. Gorst's Action in regard to Autumn Sitting of 1882.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov.* 4, 92.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 27 ; *Nov. 5*, 199 ; *Nov. 6*, 324 ; 325, 357 ; *Nov. 7*, 432 ; *Nov. 12*, 848 ; *Nov. 14*, 1043, 1045, 1054, 1057, 1061 ; *Nov, 18th*, 1315, 1316, 1317 ; *19th*, 1410, 1411, 1427.
Indian Salt Tax, Objectionable nature of Tax—Sir J. Gorst's Opinion.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 496.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. [Wilts, Devizes]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 13*, 888.

Government Departments
Transfer of Powers to County Councils—Provisions of Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 272.

Government Offices
Pencils, Use of Foreign - made Pencils—Orders to Home Manufacturers proposed.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 143 ; *Nov. 10*, 461 ; *Nov. 14th*, 1035.

Granard
Board of Guardians—Contracts given to Members of the United Irish League, alleged.
Nov. 6, 275.

Grant, Mr. Corrie [Warwickshire, Rugby]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 7*, 440 ; *Nov. 18*, 1247, 1278, 1285, 1294, 1299.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, North]
Education Inspectors—Mr. H. M. Richards's Experience in Public Elementary Schools, *Nov. 13*, 859.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 47, 48, 53 ; *Nov. 5*, 155, 161, 176 ; *Nov. 6*, 337, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365 ; *Nov. 7*, 388, 431, 436 ; *Nov. 14*, 1052, 1053, 1056 ; *Nov. 17*, 1155, 1160, 1192.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Definition of "School" in Clause 15 (*a*), *Nov. 13*, 860.

Great Eastern Railway
Thames Ironworks Level Crossing—Fatal Accident to Henry Eade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Great Northern Railway, Ireland
Newry Railway Accident—Notification to the Board of Trade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.

Great Western Railway
Breakdown near Carmarthen—Board of Trade Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1035.

Greenan
Ancient Buildings, Preservation of.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1113.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Derbyshire, S.]
Licensing Act, 1902 — Police assisting Publicans to keep the Law, *Nov. 4*, 4.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 52, 54 ; *Nov. 14*, 1049 ; *Nov. 19*, 1378, 1398.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 308, 309, 317, 328, 356, 357; *Nov. 18*, 1255, 1325, 1329; *Nov. 19*, 1397, 1439, 1440.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 731.

Guardafui, Cape
Lighthouse, Erection of—Powers with whom Foreign Office has been in communication.
Q. Nov. 11, 586.

Gurdon, Sir Brampton [Norfolk, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 370; *Nov. 13*, 964.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 668.

Guy Fawkes Celebrations
Lewes — Insults to Roman Catholics, alleged.
Q. Nov. 10, 459.

Hague Convention
South African War—Compensation for War Losses, Amount due under the Terms of the Hague Convention.
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *Nov. 5*, 249.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor*
Patent Law Amendment Bill, 2R, *Nov. 17*, 1102.

Halsey, Mr. T. F. [Herts, Watford]
Army Officers.
Furnished Quarters.
Officers who have served in South Africa — Provision of Furnished Quarters on same terms as those joining in Dec., 1902, *Nov. 13*, 863.
Provision of Barrack Furniture at the public expense, Regulations, *Nov. 6*, 264.
Interpreters — Pecuniary Advantages to Officers qualifying as Interpreters, *Nov. 6*, 264.

Hamilton, Marquess of [Londonderry]
Ireland.
Assizes—Holding North-West Winter Assize in Londonderry, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 596, 597.
Telephone Service—Towns connected by Trunk Telephone System, Guarantees, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1109.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George—*Secretary of State for India* [Middlesex, Ealing]
Afghanistan and Russia—Direct Communication from the Russian Government to the Amir, alleged, *Nov. 13*, 868.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.—*cont.*
Army.
Colonels of the Native Army — No promotion to rank of Major-General since Oct., 1900, *Nov. 17*, 1120.
Lancers, 9th—Conduct at Sialkote, Indiscriminate Punishment, *Nov. 17*, 1119, 1120.
Bengal—Expediting Administration of Justice, *Nov. 13*, 868.
Commercial Interests in China—Effect of Continuance of Silver Standard in the Philippine Islands on *Nov. 10*, 459.
Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 470—Replies to Questions and Criticisms, 515, 516, 517, 569, 570.
(For details *see* India).
Government—Relations between Government and Governed.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 564.
"Purdanishins," Disabilities of — Permitting Women to qualify as Legal Advisers, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 458.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*President of the Board of Agriculture* [Preston]
Butterine Bill—Reintroduction of, under title of Adulterated Butter Bill, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 461.
Canadian Cattle, Importation of in to England — Law requiring Cattle to be slaughtered at port of landing, *Nov. 10*, 461.
Foot and Mouth Disease—Estimated loss incurred by Farmers through importation of Cattle from Abroad, *Nov. 6*, 272.
Horses for the Army—Type of Horse required, Leaflet to Farmers, etc., proposed, *Nov. 4*, 594.

Hansard
Contract for publishing Reports of Debates, etc.—Laying on the Table of the House.
Q. Nov. 10, 453.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir W. [Monmouthshire, W.]
Autumn Sittings, Business which may properly be taken at — Sir W. Harcourt's action in regard to Autumn Sitting of 1882.
O. Mr. Ritchie, *Nov. 4*, 107.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 20, 23, 24, 71, 73; *Nov. 5*, 154, 186, 201; *Nov. 6*, 282, 285, 292, 305, 321, 335, 353, 354, 355, 361; *Nov. 12*, 775, 779, 780; *Nov. 13*, 886, 887.
Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Grant-in-Aid.
Motion to set up Committee of Supply—Unconstitutional Method of Procedure, etc., *Nov. 4*, 101, 107, 110, 111, 112.

[*cont.*

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*cont.*
- Grant-in-Aid—*cont.*
  - Source from which the Grant is to be supplied—Tactics of the Government, Failure to understand the Terms of their own Peace, etc., *Nov. 4*, 101, 107, 110, 111, 112; *Nov. 5*, 217, 219.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 13*, 950, 951.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
- Navy.
  - Channel Fleet, Able Seamen and Boys in—Proportion carried, Proportion on the "Magnificent," *Nov. 6*, 270.
  - Firing Matches, Regulations as to use of the Slow Match, *Nov. 6*, 262.
  - Practice Ammunition thrown overboard, alleged, *Nov. 6*, 269.
  - Seamen, Cost of Training, *Nov. 18*, 1228.
  - "Terrible," H.M.S.—Christmas leave of Crew, *Nov. 18*, 1228.

Harrel, Sir D.
- Resignation of Office—Grounds of acceptance, etc.
  Q. Nov. 12, 753.

Haslett, Sir J. [Belfast, N.]
- Postal Orders made payable at a Town or City being made payable only at Central Office, Inconveniences of, *Nov. 12*, 742.

Hatley
- Construction of Bridge Across the River Shannon—Terms of Loan from Public Works Commissioners.
  Q. Nov. 10, 466.

Haughton, Private
- Reservist Pay Arrears.
  Q. Nov. 11, 591.

Hay, M. C. G. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Army Reservists' Pay Arrears, *Nov. 11*, 591, 592.
- Militia and Yeomanry Bill, 2R. *Nov. 10*, 581.
- Parks—Refusal of Concessions to Local Authorities, etc., *Nov. 7*, 382.
- Telegraph Service Employees—Salary of £190 a year, Qualifications, *Nov. 13*, 859.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
- Africa, South — Prisoners who were British Subjects before Declaration of War, Treatment of, *Nov. 13*, 863.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 634, 685, 689.
- Ireland.
  - Crimes Act—Prosecution of Ladies under, Inquiry into case of Imprisonment, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 755.

Healy, Mr. T. M.—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Wreckage off the Donegal Coast—Steps taken to remove, *Nov. 12*, 757.
- Street Traffic in London—Royal Commission, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 601.

Heaton, Mr. J. Henniker [Canterbury]
- Cable Communication.
  - Pacific Cable Rates between England and Australasia, *Nov. 13*, 859.
  - Revenue derived from Cable Messages—State Purchase of Cables, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1108.
- Jerusalem and Peking, Establishment of British Post Offices, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1110.
- Mail Service.
  - China Mail Service—Superiority of the Overland Route to Mail Steamships, *Nov. 13*, 869.
  - Contracts—Date of Termination of Peninsular and Oriental, and Orient Contracts, etc., *Nov. 13*, 869.
- Telegrams, Re-direction free of charge by post, proposed, *Nov. 13*, 869.
- Turkey—Supply of Postal and Money Orders at British Post Offices, Rates, of Commission charged, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1346.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 12*, 789; *Nov. 14*, 1051, 1055.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 728.

Henry and others v. Hamill and Moody.
- Intervention of the Irish Executive, proposed.
  Q. Nov. 13, 877.

Herbert, Mr. W. H.
- Countesthorpe—Mr. Herbert's Complaint of Child being expelled from Board School with object of compelling Attendance at Church of England School, alleged.
  Q. Nov. 13, 875.

Hickman, Sir A. [Wolverhampton, W.]
- Uganda Railway—Contracts with American firm, Delay in fulfilling contracts, *Nov. 17*, 1111.

Historical Manuscripts
- Dictionary and Manuscripts in the Irish Language—Amount of Yearly Grant to Royal Irish Academy.
  Q. Nov. 18, 1237.

Historical Monuments
- *See* Ancient Monuments.

Hobhouse, Mr. H. [Somerset, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—*com.*, *Nov. 4*, 16, 50; *Nov.* 5, 159, 196; *Nov.* 6, 300, 303; *Nov.* 7, 398, 423, 430; *Nov. 13*, 915, 916, 927; *Nov. 14*, 1047; *Nov. 18*, 1329; *Nov. 19*, 1385.

Home Rule Bill, 1893
Closure by Compartments of Proceedings in Committee.
Observations on the Motion for Closuring Proceedings on the Education Bill, *Nov. 11*, 609, 622, 631, 638, 648, 649, 711.

Honduras, British
Fenwick's, Mr., Explorations and Discoveries—Report to the Colonial Office.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1352.

Hong-Kong
Garrison Officers—Increase in Lodging and Servant Allowances, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Honours and Decorations
British Orders of Knighthood, Decorations, etc., Dates of Institution—Advice of Ministers as to distribution of, Return proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 466.
South African War—Honours for War Office Officials.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1117.

Holland, Sir W. H. [York, W.R., Rotherham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 681.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas.
Under Secretary—Hon. T. H. A. E. Cochrane.

Hope, Mr. J. Fitzalan [Sheffield, Brightside]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 7*, 388, 404; *Nov. 14*, 1067; *Nov. 18*, 1255; *Nov. 19*, 1387.
Naval Construction—Armour Plate Contracts, Issue of Specifications, *Nov. 4*, 5.

Horses
Africa, South — Sale of Army Horses suffering from Infectious Disease, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 590.

Horses for the Army
Remount Department — Status of Veterinary Officers who accompanied Remount Officers abroad.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 587.
Type of Horses required, Leaflet to Farmers and Horse-breeders.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 594.

Hospitals
Lewis, Island of—Additional Accommodation for Infectious Diseases.
Qs. *Nov. 11*, 594; *Nov. 12th*, 748.

Howard, Mr. Joseph [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Attendance Officers, Security of Tenure—Insertion of Clause in the Bill, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1106.

Howden Cleugh
Postmaster, Resignation of—Scale of Remuneration, Length of Service, etc.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 453.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 5*, 175; *Nov. 6*, 294, 333, 358; *Nov. 7*, 397; *Nov. 12*, 767; *Nov. 13* 941; *Nov. 18*, 1319.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [York, W.R., Morley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 5*, 195; *Nov. 13*, 942; *Nov. 17*, 1176, 1181, 1182, 1190; *Nov. 19*, 1369, 1425.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 728, 735.
Howden Cleugh Postmaster, Resignation—Scale of Remuneration, Length of Service, etc., *Nov 10*, 453.

Hutton, Mr. J. [York, N.R., Richmond]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Trust Endowments, *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Hyacinth, H.M.S.
Defects in Machinery, Experiments with Screws, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1356.

Ilbert, Sir Courtenay
Appropriation Act, Constitutional Importance of—Sir C. Ilbert's Opinion.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 88.

Immigration
Alien Immigration, *see* that title.

Import Duties
See Customs Duties.

Imports and Exports
Canadian Bounty-fed Iron and Steel, Quantity imported.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 8.

Imprisonment of Members
Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment of, *see* Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party.

Income Tax
Co-operative and Friendly Societies—Payment of Income Tax on Dividends and Profits.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1242.
Employers furnishing list of their employees liable for Income Tax.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1241.
Ireland—Armagh Appeals, Holding Sittings at Armagh instead of Portadown, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 758.

[*cont.*

Income Tax—*cont.*
Scotland—Crown Property, Income Tax Arrears, Steps taken to recover.
Q. Nov. 14, 1036.

India
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
Under Secretary—Earl Percy.
Administration of Indian Affairs.
Continuity of Policy—Extension of Lord Curzon's Term of Office, proposed.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 556.
Difficulties likely to arise from British tendency to assume that Fiscal or Industrial Systems successful in Great Britain must succeed in India also.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 490.
Excise Department, Charge against of pushing Sale of Intoxicants for the sake of Revenue.
Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 524, 539.
Native Opinion as an Aid to Parliamentary Understanding of Indian Affairs.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 512.
Relations between Government and Governed, Lord G. Hamilton on.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 564.
Responsibility of Parliament and of Secretary of State for India, Need for insistence on, etc.
References to, in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 506, 509, 510, 513.
Secretary of State, Powers of, Position of Members of Council.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Caine, Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 517.
Agriculture
Condition of — Need for improved methods, etc.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 551.
Increase in Land under Cultivation.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 10*, 574.
American Mission in the Deccan, Work in training Famine Waifs for Industrial Occupations.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 553.
Army.
British Government Proposals of Feb., 1902—Observations of the Viceroy, etc., Date of circulating Papers.
Q. Nov. 4, 7.
Colonels of the Native Army—No promotion to rank of Major-General since Oct., 1900.
Q. Nov. 17, 1120.

India—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Expenditure.
Increase in Expenditure.
References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 472, 484, 513, 522, 564.
Policy regulating Expenditure.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 484.
Lancers, 9th—Conduct at Sialkote, Indiscriminate Punishment of the Regiment.
Q. Nov. 17, 1119.
Medical Corps Officers, Relief Programme—Exclusion of Officers with less than Six Years Service in India.
Q. Nov. 10, 456.
Military Charges, Apportionment between Indian and Imperial Exchequers.
Aden Fortress.
Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Nov. 10*, 503; Mr. Moon, 514.
Pay of British Troops in India, Increase in Pay under Army Reorganization Scheme, Additional Charge on India, etc.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 486, 519; Sir C. Dilke, 511, 555.
Troops withdrawn for Service outside India, etc.
References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 471, 483, 485, 522, 559.
Native Regiments, British Officers in, Increase in Number, proposed.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 513.
Requirements of India and the Army Reorganization Proposals.
O. Lord George Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 486.
Reserve for the Empire, India as—Grant in recognition of the fact, proposed.
O. Mr. Caine, *Nov. 10*, 523.
Assam, *see* that title.
Bengal — Expediting Administration of Justice.
Q. Nov. 13, 868.
British Indian Subjects, Disabilities in the Colonies — Retaliatory Legislation by Indian Administration, proposed.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 554, 555.
Budget, *see* sub-heading Finance—Annual Statement.
Colonial Conference in London — Non-Representation of India.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 511; Lord G. Hamilton, 517.
Condition of the People — Standard of Life, Pressure of Taxation, etc.
References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 474 499, 508, 572, 574.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Coronation of King Edward.
Cost of entertaining Indian Guests, *see* sub-heading Finance—Apportionment of Charges.
Durbar at Delhi, Objects, Cost, etc.
References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 490, 556, 572.
Special significance for India, Loyalty of Native Princes, etc.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 489.
Cotton Industry
China Trade—Effect of falling Silver.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 562.
Crisis in—Relation to Currency changes, etc.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 561.
Excise Duties on Cotton Goods, Remission of, proposed.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 563.
Increase in Indian-made Cotton.
O. Mr. Moon, *Nov. 10*, 515.
Currency.
Gold Standard, Establishment of, etc.
Fall of the Rupee, Effect on Trade, Revenue, etc.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 559; Lord G. Hamilton, 570.
Gold Remittances, Method of Investment.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 262.
Gold Reserve Fund.
Amount of.
Qs. *Nov. 6*, 262; *Nov. 7*, 383.
Established from Profits on Coinage of Rupees.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 471, 472; Sir H. Fowler, 498.
Trade, Effect on.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 562; Sir E. Vincent, 565; Mr. Wylie, 574.
Mints, Closing in Native States.
Q. *Nov 7*, 383.
Silver Currency—Number of Rupees Coined, Amount of Silver imported, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 6*, 262; *Nov. 7*, 383.
Curzon, Lord.
Extension of Term of Office, proposed.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 556.
Land Assessment Question—Reply to Mr. Romesh Dutt's Charges of Over-Assessment.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 478.
Splendid Services of.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 490; Sir M. Bhownaggree, 556.

India—*cont.*
Customs Revenue, Increase in.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 475; Mr. Emmott, 558.
Education—Technical Instruction in Agricultural and Industrial Occupations, Establishment of Classes pending Execution of Lord Curzon's schemes, proposed.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 551.
Empire.
Position of India in regard to.
O. Mr. H. Roberts, *Nov. 10*, 507.
Sacrifices made by India for the Empire.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 509, 510; Sir M. Bhownaggree, 556.
Expenditure, *see* sub-heading Finance.
Famine.
Cause of—Over-Assessment of Land Revenue, Mr. Romesh Dutt's Allegations.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov 10*, 478.
Insurance Fund, History of the 25 years of its Life.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 499.
Remission of Arrears of Rents to Tenants who have suffered in consequence of the Famine.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 493.
Finance.
Annual Financial Statement *Nov. 10*, 470.
Notation Employed in Explanatory Memorandums.
Q. *Nov. 7*, 384.
Opportunity for Resuming Debate.
Qs. *Nov. 10*, 469; *Nov. 11*, 632; *Nov. 18*, 1238.
Apportionment of Charges between Indian and Imperial Exchequers.
Arbitration on points in Dispute—Lord Alverstone's Agreement to act as Arbitrator.
Os. Lord. G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 485; Sir M. Bhownaggree, 555.
Coronation, Cost of Entertaining Indian Guests—Scale of Hospitality necessary, etc.
Q. *Nov. 7*, 383.
References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 487, 491, 564, 572.
India Office, Cost of—Imperial Exchequer proposed Contribution.
References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov 10, 502, 514, 516.
Military Charges, *see* sub-heading Army.

India—*cont.*
  Finance—*cont.*
    Condition of Indian Finances in 1858, Services of Sir T. Seccombe and Sir H. Waterfield.
      O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 473.
    Currency, *see* that sub-heading.
    Drink and Drunkenness, Revenue derived from—Charge against Administration of Excise Department.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 523, 537.
    Expenditure—Increase in Indian and British Expenditure compared.
      O. Lord George Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 483.
    Expenditure Commission Recommendation, Transfer of Items of Charge to the British Exchequer.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 485, 486, 502, 514, 516.
    Home Charges, etc.—Amount drawn from India during present Financial Year.
      Q. *Nov. 5*, 134.
    Land Revenue, *see* that sub-heading.
    Navy Expenditure, India's contribution towards.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 511; Lord G. Hamilton 519.
    Reserves, Creation of prior to Reduction of Taxation, proposed.
      Os. Sir E. Vincent, *Nov. 10*, 567; Lord G. Hamilton, 571.
    Surpluses of the past three years, Sources of, etc.—Dangers of dealing with large Surpluses.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 470, 472, 500, 521, 522, 557.
    Taxation, *see* that Sub-heading.
  Gold Currency, *see* sub-heading Currency.
  Government of India, *see* sub-heading Administration of Indian Affairs.
  Grant-in-Aid of Indian Expenditure, Placing on the Estimates, proposed.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 505, 511, 518.
    Party Considerations, Danger of importing into the Discussion of Indian Affairs.
      O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 518.
  Income Tax — Taxing Incomes of 500 *Rs.*, Raising existing Exemptions, etc.
      O. Mr Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 563.
  Intoxicants, Revenue derived from Sale of, Increase in consumption of—Charge against Administration of Excise Department.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 524, 539.

India—*cont.*
  Irrigation Works, Expenditure on—Recommendations of Famine Commission, Inquiry proposed.
      O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 10*, 573.
  Land—Cultivated Lands.
    Acreage in 1890-91, and in 1900-01.
      Q. *Nov. 17*, 1111.
    Increase in Acreage.
      O. Mr Wylie, *Nov. 10*, 574.
    Statistics of Cultivated and Waste Lands, 1880-1902.
      Q. *Nov. 7*, 382.
  Land Revenue Assessment—Indebtedness of Cultivators
    Curzon's, Lord, Reply to Mr. Romesh Dutt's charge of over Assessment.
      O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 478.
    Elasticity in Methods of Collection of Tax, etc., Need for.
      Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 479; Sir E. Vincent, 566.
    Mistakes in Assessment a Cause of indebtedness of Cultivating Classes.
      Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 475; Sir C. Dilke, 508.
    System of Conciliation between Creditors and Debtors, Successful working of.
      O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 480.
  Native Princes, Personal Loyalty towards the King-Emperor.
      O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 489.
  Navy in Indian Waters—Contribution of India.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 511; Lord G. Hamilton, 519.
  Opium Trade with China, Decrease in Revenue derived from.
      O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 481.
  Parliament—Imperial Parliament.
    Facilities for Discussion of Indian Affairs — Need for increased facilities.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 501, 503, 512, 516, 573.
      Revival of Practice in use prior to 1858, proposed.
        Os. Sir E. Vincent, *Nov. 10*, 568; Lord G. Hamilton, 571.
    Representation of India, Impossibility of.
      O. Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 510.
    Responsibility for Indian Affairs, Need for recognition of, etc.
      References to in Debate on Financial Statement, *Nov. 10*, 506, 509, 510, 513.
  "Purdanishins," Disabilities of—Permitting competent Women to qualify as Legal Advisers, proposed.
      Q. *Nov. 10*, 458.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

- Railways.
  - Development of, Expenditure on.
    - *O.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 472.
  - Promotion of Construction—Need for Feeder Lines, Government discouragement of private enterprise, etc.
    - *Os.* Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 498; Lord G. Hamilton, 569.
  - Purchase of Railways by Indian Government.
    - *O.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 476.
  - Receipts, Increase in.
    - *Os.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 476; Mr. Emmott, 558.
- Salt Tax, Question of Reduction of—Objections to Tax, Effect on health of the People, Unsatisfactory Receipts, Injustice of perpetuating Tax imposed to meet exceptional circumstances, etc.
  - *References to in Debate on Financial Statement, Nov. 10*, 481, 494, 497, 563, 566.
- Sanitary Measures—Report for 1900–1901, Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1345.
- Scinde, Punjab and Delhi Railway—Deposit at Bank of England belonging to Shareholders, Treasury acquiring Control.
  - *Q. Nov. 5*, 134.
- Sialkote—Conduct of the 9th Lancers, Indiscriminate Punishment of the Regiment.
  - *Q. Nov. 17*, 1119.
- Silver Ornaments, Sale by Natives—Effect of Currency Changes on price obtained, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 564.
- Sugar Bounties—Effect of Countervailing Duties Act.
  - *O.* Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 10*, 574.
- Taxation—
  - Exceptional Taxation, Retention of when the circumstances necessitating its imposition have passed away.
    - *O.* Sir R. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 494.
  - Fall of the Rupee, Extra Taxation entailed by.
    - *O.* Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 559.
  - Proceeds of Taxation, Increase in, as a Criterion of Prosperity.
    - *Os.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 474, 572.
  - Reduction of, proposed.
    - *O.* Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 563.
    - Precautions necesssary—Peculiar Situation of the Indian Government.
      - *Os.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 482, 571; Sir E. Vincent, 566.
- Technical Instruction, *see* sub-heading Education.

India—*cont.*

- Trade—
  - China, Commercial Interests in—Effect of Continuance of Silver Standard in the Philippine Islands on.
    - *Q. Nov. 10*, 459.
  - Currency Changes, Effect of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 562; Sir E. Vincent, 565; Lord G. Hamilton, 570.
  - External Trade, Increase in.
    - *Os.* Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 475; Mr. Emmott, 560.
  - India, England's Fourth best Customer.
    - *O.* Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 513.

India Office

- Cost of, Apportionment of Charges between Indian and Imperial Exchequers, *see* India—Finance, Apportionment of Charges.
- Salaries and Allowances—Omission to lay before the House.
  - *O.* Mr. Moon, *Nov. 10*, 514.

Intermediate Education, Ireland

- Examinations for 1903—Rule Presented, *Nov. 14*, 1033.

Ireland

- *Lord Lieutenant*—Earl of Dudley.
- *Chief Secretary*—Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.
- *Attorney General*—Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
- *Lord Chancellor*—Lord Ashbourne.
- Agrarian Outrages—Return Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 10*, 450.
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Instruction in the Irish Language, Regulations preventing sanction of Expenditure, alleged.
  - *Q. Nov. 13*, 878.
- Ancient Monuments, for collective heading *see* Ancient Monuments.
- Antrim Census Returns, Delay in issue.
  - *Q. Nov. 5*, 147.
- Armagh.
  - Census Returns, Delay in issue.
    - *Q. Nov. 5*, 147.
  - Income Tax Appeals—Holding Sittings at Armagh instead of Portadown proposed.
    - *Q. Nov. 12*, 758.
- Assizes, for collective heading, *see* Assizes.
- Athlone Police, Outbreak of Fever among—Refusal of Inspector-General of Constabulary to pay Cost of Medical Attendance at Fever Hospital, alleged.
  - *Q. Nov. 10*, 455.
- Bagnalstown.
  - Petty Sessions Summonses — Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in Cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners.
    - *Q. Nov. 19*, 1361.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Bagualstown—*cont.*
Water Supply, Improvement in.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1362.
Ballaghaderreen
Refusal of Transfer of Publican's Licence to Mr. James Casey.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 274.
Bankruptcy Procedure—Official Assignees Appeals, Amount of Costs paid out of Unclaimed Dividend Account in Bank of Ireland.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 144.
Basic Slag, Importation of Spurious Slag—Proceedings against Agent, Protection for Farmers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 3.
Belfast, *see* that title.
Boyle, No. 2 District Council, Complaint of delay in issue of Supplemental Loan.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 145.
Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Surplus Profit—Enforcing Section 5 of Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 873.
Canadian Mail Service—Sligo as a Port of Call, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.
Carlow—Prosecutions under the Sanitary Laws dismissed, Enforcing the Law, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 755.
Carndonagh, *see* that title.
Carrick-on-Shannon Prison—Handing over disused Prison to Leitrim Agricultural and Technical Committee.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.
Census—Delay in issue of Armagh, Antrim and Tipperary Returns.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 147.
Condition of—Administration of Crimes Act, Revival of Coercion, etc.—Opportunity for discussion of Irish Grievances, Special Facilities during the Autumn Sitting.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 14.
Congested Districts Board, for collective heading, *see* Congested Districts Board.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, for collective heading, *see* Constabulary.
Consumption, Spread of—Provision of Sanatorium.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 866.
Coonagh—Colonel Finch's Property, Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 12.
County Boroughs — Rateable Value, Borrowing Powers, Amount borrowed, and amount of Loans repaid—Return Ordered, *Nov. 14*, 1034.
County Councillors—Disqualification of Dispensary Doctors.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

Ireland—*cont.*
Court Houses.
Maintenance of—Number of County Councils refusing to vote money.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1128.
Use by District Councils—Number of Refusals.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 879.
Crimes Act, for collective heading *see* Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887.
Deaf and Dumb, Maintenance of, as an Imperial Charge, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 12.
Dillon Estate, *see* that title.
Dispensary Medical Officers, *see* Medical Officers, Ireland.
Donegal.
Londonderry and Donegal Union Boundaries, Charge in—Date of Local Government Board Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 877.
Wreckage off the Coast—Steps taken to remove.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.
Drogheda—St. Mary's National School, Head Teacher losing £50 a year owing to Commissioners' interpretation of New Rules.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 147; *Nov. 13*, 879.
Dublin, *see* that title.
Dungannon Police—Expenses of Extra Police.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1114.
Edgeworthstown Postmastership—Name, Salary, and Nationality of Telegraphist appointed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 259.
Education, for collective heading, *see* Education.
Emyvale Dispensary Medical Officer, Reduction of Salary below sum arranged by Local Authority.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 867.
Evictions—Return Presented, *Nov. 11*, 585.
Fair Rents—Longford and Leitrim, Number of Applications pending—Date of next Sub-Commission Sittings.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.
Firearms, Discharge on Public Road near Silverbridge.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.
Fisheries, for collective heading, *see* Fisheries.
Game Licences, Evasions in King's County—Precautions taken to Ensure Compliance with the Law, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1348.
Gara Lough Eel Fishery — Proprietor suffering loss owing to Floods caused by Dillon Estate Drainage Operations, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 597.
Greenan—Preservation of Ancient Buildings.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1113.

Ireland—*cont.*

Harrell, Sir D., Resignation of Office, Grounds of acceptance, etc.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.

Henry and others *v.* Hamill and Moody—Intervention of the Irish Executive proposed.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 877.

Intermediate Education—Rule for Examinations for 1903 Presented, *Nov. 14*, 1033.

Irish Language, *see* that title.

Labourers' Acts—Boyle No. 2 District Council, Complaint of delay in issue of Supplemental Loan.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 145.

Labourers' Cottages, for collective heading *see* Labourers' Cottages.

Land Question, *see* that title.

Leitrim, *see* that title.

Limavady Quarter Sessions—Henry and others *v.* Hamill and Moody, Government Intervention, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 877.

Limerick, *see* that title.

Local Authorities, Contracts—Preference given to Members of the United Irish League, Action of the Government.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 275.

Local Government Board, *see* that title.

Londonderry, *see* that title.

Longford, *see* that title.

Lurgan Post Office—Insanitary Condition of temporary premises, Delay in Erection of New Post Office, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 273.

Macauley's, Mr. J., Disloyal Speech at Belfast—Government Action.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 880.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, *see* that title.

Malicious Injuries, Compensation for—Case of Mr. R. Sproule.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 274.

Manuscripts and Dictionary of the Irish Language—Amount of yearly grant to Royal Irish Academy.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1237.

Marine Works Act—Allocation of Moneys voted under.
Qs. *Nov. 10*, 464; *Nov. 18*, 1231.

Medical Officers, *see* that title.

Middleton Guardians—Use of Board Room for Political Meetings, Proceedings against by the Crown—Precedent for Legal Proceedings.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 463.

Monaghan.
  Constables, Number doing Town Duty, Religious Denominations, etc.
  Q. *Nov. 4*, 13.
  Local Government Act, Working of—Inquiry proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 13*, 866.

Ireland—*cont.*

Muldowney, Michael, Imprisonment for Complicity in the Craughwell Murder—Date of Release.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1238.

National School Teachers, *see* that title.

Newbridge.
  Artisans' Cottages—Board of Works refusing to issue final instalment of Loan, alleged.
  Q. *Nov. 19*, 1362.
  Postmastership — Qualifications of Officer appointed, Advertisement of Appointment in Post Office Circular, etc.
  Q. *Nov. 6*, 260.

Newry Railway Accident—Notification to the Board of Trade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.

Nuns begging alms in Dublin Custom House, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 13.

Omagh Barracks—Increasing Accommodation and Number of Troops proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 6*, 268, 269.

Ordnance Survey Memoirs, Custody of Manuscripts—Printing proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1112.

Poor Law Children—Board refusing permission to Lady Inspector to examine boarded-out children, etc.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1127.

Poor Law Unions, *see* that title.

Port Erlin Boat Slip—Arrangements for construction of.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 759.

Post Office—For collective heading, *see* Post Office.

Postmasters—For collective heading, *see* Postmasters.

Railways — For collective heading *see* Railways.

Rathcormac Gaelic Tournament—Intrusion of the Police.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Rating Appeals, Number of—Results of Appeals.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1363.

Road Labour Scheme for Limerick, Expediting Working of.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1113.

Rock Angus, Lighting proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1127.

Roscommon, County and District Council Elections — Re-elected Councillors acting as paid Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks at contested Elections.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1124.

Roscrea.
  Justices of the Peace—Appointment of Additional Justices proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.
  Labourers' Cottages, Applications for—Selection of Sites by the District Council.
  Q. *Nov. 12*, 751.

Ireland—*cont.*

Sanitary Laws, Enforcement of—Prosecutions at Carlow dismissed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 755.

Shannon River, Construction of Bridge at Hatley—Terms of Loan from Public Works Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 466.

Silverbridge—Revolver fired at Tullyvallen National Band, Prosecution.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

Sneem Licensing Case—Police opposing Licence of Mary Doyle, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Starkie's, Dr., Statements against Primary School Managers—Roman Catholic Managers' Resolutions, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 147 ; *Nov. 12*, 752.

Strokestown Union Amalgamation, Resolution.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 880.

Tallow Conspiracy Case, O'Keeffe *v.* Walsh—Charge of Lord Chief Baron, Breach of Public Trust by Officials, alleged.
Qs. *Nov. 17*, 1128 ; *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Tara, Hill of—Excavations, Steps taken to preserve Historical Monuments from destruction.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 463.

Telephone Service—Towns connected by Trunk Telephone System, Guarantees, etc.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1109.

Thomastown Guardians' Complaints as to action of District Inspector Fleming.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1363.

Tramways Acts, Amendment proposed—Publication of Report of Public Works Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 598.

Trawling in Dublin Bay—Destruction of line fishing.
Q. *Nov.* 12, 753.

Tullyvallen National Band, Revolver fired at, near Silverbridge—Prosecution.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

Unions, *see* Poor Law Unions, Ireland.

United Irish League—Local Authorities, Contracts—Preference given to Members of the League, Action of the Government.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 275.

University Education, Royal Commission—Date of Report.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1129.

Valuation Acts—Report of Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, Presented, *Nov. 12*, 761.

Irish Academy, Royal

Grant paid to, for Copying Irish Manuscripts, etc.—Transfer of, to the Irish Texts Society.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1237.

Irish Language

Inspectors—Appointment of Inspectors, capable of examining pupils in Irish, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1129.

Instruction in—Regulations preventing Department of Agriculture from sanctioning expenditure, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

Letters and Postcards addressed in Irish, non-delivery of—Appointment of Post Office officials having knowledge of the Irish language, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 6*, 273 ; *Nov. 10*, 463 ; *Nov. 12*, 756 ; *Nov. 18*, 1237.

Manuscripts and Dictionary of the Irish Language—Amount of yearly grant to Royal Irish Academy.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1237.

Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party

Imprisonment of Members.

Communications to the Speaker, *Nov. 6*, 257 ; *Nov. 17*, 1103.

Number in prison under hard labour sentences—Modification of Prison Rules.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 146.

Permission to receive Parliamentary Papers, and to communicate with House of Commons Authorities—Modification of Prison Rules, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Iron and Steel

Canadian Pig-Iron and Steel, Rate of Bounty on Export—Quantity imported into Great Britain.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 8.

Islay

Port Ellen, Mail Delays.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 858.

Islington

Parish Church Bells, Ringing on King's Birthday—Local Government Board Auditor disallowing cost.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1122.

"Jackal," H.M.S.

Withdrawal for Repairs, alleged—Cruisers placed at disposal of Scottish Fishery Board.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 143.

Japan

British Government entering into Reciprocal Agreement with Foreign Power—Statement proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. A. F.—*Deputy Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means* [Hants, N.]

Ruling as Deputy-Chairman, Irrelevant Observations — South African War, Compensation for Losses, etc., Discussing Irrigation Schemes and Labour Question, etc., *Nov. 5*, 216, 217, 223, 225.

[*cont.*

Jerusalem
British Post Office, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1110.
British Residents' Complaints as to treatment by the Consulate.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 593.

Jews
Treatment of Jews in Roumania—American Note, Date of Publication of Correspondence.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1231.

Johannesburg
Local Rates, Raising — Consent of the Governor of the Transvaal.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 266.

Johnstone, Mr. [Sussex, Horsham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 6*, 309; *Nov. 7*, 389; *Nov. 12*, 820, 849; *Nov. 18*, 1312.
Lynch, Mr. A., Arrest of—Number of Remands, Date of resuming Trial, etc., *Nov. 18*, 1230.
Uganda Railway—Rates on Articles taken by Passengers, *Nov. 18*, 1241.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 55; *Nov. 5*, 174; *Nov. 6*, 284, 289; *Nov. 7*, 415; *Nov. 12*, 769; *Nov. 13*, 911, 915; *Nov. 14*, 1092.

Judicial Rents, Ireland
Longford and Leitrim, Number of Applications pending—Date of next Sub-Commission Sittings.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Naval Seamen Pensioners Re-engaged—Modification of terms proposed, *Nov. 12*, 742.

Kemp, Mr. G. [Lancashire, Heywood]
Cape Colony, Loyalists of—Question as to Compensation for War Losses, *Nov. 6*, 345.

Kent Garrison Artillery Volunteers
Armament — Delay in issue of 6-inch Howitzers.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 456.

Kenyon, Mr. G. T. [Denbigh.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 771.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 19*, 1456.

King Edward VII.
Birthday — Ringing Bells of Islington Parish Church, Local Government Board Auditor disallowing cost.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1122.

Kitchener, Vis.
Boer Requisition Notes issued during the War—Question of acknowledging.
O. Sir H. Campbell - Bannerman, *Nov. 5*, 243.
Horses, Mules, Oxen, etc., Sale of, to the Repatriation Board—Price, paid, etc.
O. Mr. Lambert, *Nov. 5*, 227.

Knowles, Mr. Lees [Salford, W.]
Southwark Denominational Schools, Re-Building—Application of Money from City Parochial Charities Fund, *Nov. 13*, 874, 875.

Kobe
Trade Reports Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill, 2R, *Nov. 10*, 576.
Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
  Administration, Probable Cost of, *Nov. 5*, 225.
  Grant in Aid.
    Inadequacy of Grant, Allocation of the £2 000,000 required for "other persons" (Loyalists, etc.), *Nov. 5*, 223.
    Loyalists, Grant to—Allocation, Method of Distribution, etc., *Nov. 6*, 344, 345.
Treaties with Foreign Powers with regard to China and Japan, *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Labour Department of the Board of Trade
Trade Unions—Report, with Comparative Statistics, Presented, *Nov. 4*, 3; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Roscrea—Applications for Cottages, Selection of Sites by the District Council.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 751.

Labourers [Ireland] Acts
Boyle No. 2 District Council, Complaint of delay in issue of Supplemental Loan.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 145.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]
Africa, South—Sale of Army Horses suffering from Infectious Disease, alleged, *Nov. 5*, 226; *Nov. 11*, 590.
China—British Influence in the Yangtsze. Valley, *Nov. 4*, 7.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 158.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Loan Expenses, Inclusion in total expenses of Local Authorities, *Nov. 14*, 1034.
"Good Hope," Route arranged for Mr. Chamberlain's Tour, *Nov. 11*, 589.
Income Tax--Co-operative and Friendly Societies, Payment of Income Tax on Dividends and Profits, *Nov. 18*, 1242
Plymtree Schoolroom, Refusal of use for Political Meetings—Withdrawal of Parliamentary Grant proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1236, 1237.

[*cont.*

Lambert, Mr. G.—*cont.*

Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Grant in Aid—Amount of Boer Repatriation Grant already expended, Prices of Animals, Question as to wisdom of introducing a system of Loans for Burghers, *Nov. 5*, 137, 138, 226; *Nov. 11*, 591.

Lamps.

Bronze Scroll-Work Lamps on London Bridge, Advertising for Sale.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 4.

Lanarkshire [Middle Ward District] Water Order Confirmation Bill

l. 3R*, *Nov. 17*, 1099.

Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Land Commission, Ireland

Fair Rents—Longford and Leitrim, Number of Applications pending—Date of next Sub-Commission Sittings.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

Land Purchase, Ireland

Coonagh, Col. Finch's Property—Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 12.

Land Question, Ireland

"Future Tenants" in County Leitrim, Number created since Land Act of 1881—Safeguarding Interests, Deputation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 464.

Legislation—Anticipatory Statement proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 12*, 753; *Nov. 17*, 1129.

Registration of Land—Registering Titles a second time under New Rules, Circular of Longford Registrar.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1125.

Langley, Mr. Batty [Sheffield, Attercliffe]

Education, Fees—Number of Schools charging Fees, Amount received, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1123.

Larbert

Railway Accident—Board of Trade Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 872.

Law, Sir E.

Criticism of Mr. Gokhale's Indian Trade Statistics.
O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 560.

Lee, Mr. Arthur [Hants, Fareham]

Army.

Entrance Examinations Syllabus—Inconvenience caused to Public Schools by uncertainty respecting, *Nov. 19*, 1355.

Recruiting.

Physical Standards, Alterations in, *Nov. 19*, 1351.

Lee, Mr. Arthur—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Recruiting—*cont.*

Statistics of Recruiting in the Regular Army and Militia since the conclusion of the South African War, *Nov. 19*, 1351.

Leese, Sir J. [Lancashire, Accrington]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov.* 4, 24, 119; *Nov. 6*, 282, 303; *Nov. 13*, 893.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 669.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square

India.

Conduct of 9th Lancers at Sialkote, Indiscriminate Punishment, *Nov. 17*, 1120.

Legislation

Jealousy of too much Legislation—Efficiency in Legislation, etc.
O. Mr. P. Smith, *Nov. 11*, 646, 647

Leitrim

Agricultural and Technical Committee—Carrick-on-Shannon Disused Prison, Handing over to the Committee.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

Fair Rent Applications, Number pending—Date of next Sub-Commission Sitting.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

"Future Tenants" of Estates, Number created since Land Act of 1881—Safeguarding Interests, Deputation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*. 464.

Unions Amalgamation—Resolutions.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 880.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]

Canadian Cattle imported into England—Law requiring Cattle to be slaughtered at Port of Landing, *Nov. 10*, 461.

Volunteer Officers—South African War Army Commissions, Granting proposed, *Nov. 12*, 746; *Nov. 19*, 1352.

Pay, Leave and Decorations—Treatment of Volunteers, *Nov. 19*, 1352.

Leonard, R.

Sergeant in 6th Dragoons writing to Secretary of State for War, Degradation to the Ranks.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1118.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]

Naval Salutes, Number of Accidents during the last ten years, *Nov. 12*, 741.

Level Crossings

Thames Ironworks Level Crossing—Fatal Accident to Henry Eade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Lewes

Guy Fawkes Celebrations — Insults to Roman Catholics, alleged.
Q. Nov. 10, 459.

Lewis, Island of

Buildings, Number of, erected under Byelaws of the District Committee of County Council of Ross and Cromarty.
Q. Nov. 6, 259.

Destitution among Cottars and Fishermen, Acquisition of Land by Congested Districts Board, proposed
Qs. Nov. 5, 142; *Nov. 17*, 1108.

Fisheries—Provision of Gunboat to protect Line Fishermen against Trawlers.
Qs. Nov. 11, 595; *Nov. 12*, 750.

Hospitals at Carloway Swanabost, Ness and Leurbost Locks, Necessity for.
Qs. Nov. 11, 594; *Nov. 12*, 748.

Local Government Board Inquiry into Public Health Questions—Name of Inspecting Officer, Places visited, etc.
Qs. Nov. 5, 132; *Nov. 18*, 1234.

Ness.

Harbour of Port Ness, Condition of—Report, Selection of Engineer.
Qs. Nov. 17, 1107; *Nov. 19*, 1348.

Typhus, Death from — Insanitary Condition of the house in which Mackay died, etc.
Q. Nov. 12, 750.

Poultry Breeding in—Number of Sittings of Eggs provided by the Congested Districts Board.
Q. Nov. 19, 1348.

Sanitary Condition—Local Government Inspector's Report.
Q. Nov. 18, 1234.

Social Condition of the People—Special Report of Crofters' Commission.
Q. Nov. 18, 1233.

Tolsta School, Number of Pupils—Cause of temporary Closing of School, etc.
Q. Nov. 13, 874.

Lewis, Mr. Herbert [Flint Borough]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 44; *Nov. 6*, 334; *Nov. 13*, 885, 932, 947; *Nov. 17*, 1165, 1171, 1203; *Nov. 18*, 1256, 1260, 1296; *Nov. 19*, 1426, 1447, 1448, 1451, 1465, 1466.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, Education Committee — Co-opted Members, Definition of "Other Bodies," *Nov. 10*, 454.

Lewis, Sir George Cornwall

Appropriation Act, Importance as Constitutional Check on Ministers.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 88.

Licensing Act, 1902

Police assisting Publicans to keep the Law.
Q. Nov. 4, 4.

Light Railways

Orders Presented, *Nov. 10*, 451, 452; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Lights and Lighthouses

Guardafui Cape, Erection of Lighthouse—Powers with whom Foreign Office had been in communication.
Q. Nov. 11, 586.

Rock Angus, Lighting, proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1127.

Limavady Quarter Sessions

Henry and Others *v.* Hamill and Moody—Government Intervention, proposed.
Q. Nov. 13, 877.

Limerick

Road Labour Scheme, Expediting Working of.
Q. Nov. 17, 1113.

Trade of Port of Limerick, Injury done to by Congested Districts Board Subsidy to Clyde Company at Cork.
Q. Nov 12, 752.

Lindsay, H.

Prosecution for Assault in Belfast.
Os. Nov. 17, 1125.

Liverpool, Borough of

Parliamentary By-Election—New Member Sworn for East Toxteth Division, *Nov. 11*, 604.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws,

Indian Traffic, *see* India—Intoxicants, also Assam — Government Liquor Shops.

Ireland.

Ballaghaderreen—Refusal of Transfer of Publican's Licence to Mr. James Casey.
Q. Nov. 6, 274.

Sneem, Police opposing Licence of Mary Doyle, alleged.
Q. Nov. 17, 1115.

Police assisting Publicans to keep the Law.
Q. Nov. 4, 4.

Sunday Trading—Enforcing Lord's Day Observance Act against Publicans, proposed
Q. Nov. 17, 1121.

Transvaal—Publication of Liquor Ordinance.
Q. Nov. 5, 136.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, etc.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 31, 32, 54, 75; *Nov. 5*, 177, 182, 187; *Nov. 6*, 284, 288, 298, 302, 303, 325, 326, 329, 359, 363, 364, 365; *Nov. 7*, 396, 418, 433, 434; *Nov. 12*, 787, 788; *Nov. 13*, 897, 898, 913, 914, 918, 930, 934, 949, 951; *Nov. 14*, 1056, 1067, 1068; *Nov. 17*, 1146, 1153, 1182, 1193, 1194, 1195; *Nov. 18*, 1246, 1262, 1271, 1289, 1291, 1292, 1297, 1305, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1315, 1316, 1320, 1334; *Nov. 19*, 1369, 1370, 1373, 1391, 1394, 1433, 1449, 1453, 1457, 1459, 1462, 1465.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 660, 663, 705.

Local Authorities
Ireland.
Contracts, Giving Preference to Members of the United Irish League, Action of the Government.
Q. Nov. 6, 275.
Parks, Refusal of Concessions to Local Authorities, etc.
Q. Nov. 7, 382.

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (London) (No. 2) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading—Bill Withdrawn, *Nov. 18*, 1242.

Local Government Act, Ireland
Monaghan—Working of the Act, Inquiry proposed.
Q. Nov. 13, 866.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. J. Grant Lawson.

Local Government Board, Ireland
Auditors' Examinations, Rules as to Second Nomination, etc.
Q. Nov. 11, 598.
Inspectors and Auditors.
Names, Date of Appointment, Age and Salaries—Return.
Q. Nov. 10, 454.
Vacancies—Claims of Union Officials.
Q. Nov. 10, 455.
Report, Want of Index.
Q. Nov. 5, 148.

Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
Date of proceeding with the Bill.
Q. Nov. 11, 600.

Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill
Transfer of Government Departmental Powers to County Councils — Provisions of the Bill.
Q. Nov. 6, 272.

Local Records
Collection and Custody of—Report of Committee with Appendices Presented, *Nov. 10*, 449.

Lockwood, Lt. Col. A. R. [Essex, Epping]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov 14*, 1050.

Logan, Mr. J. W. [Leicester, Harborough]
Countesthorpe—Mr. Herbert's Complaint of Child being expelled from Board School with object of compelling attendance at Church of England School, *Nov. 13*, 875.
Education, (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 18*, 1273.

Lombard Street
All Hallows Church, Vacancy—Appointment of Commission under Union of Benefices Act.
Q. Nov. 4, 5.

London
Street Traffic, Means of Locomotion and Transportation — Royal Commission, proposed.
Nov. 11, 601; *Nov. 12*, 759; *Nov. 17*, 1116.

London Bridge
Bronze Scroll Work Lamps, Advertising for Sale.
Q. Nov. 4, 4.

London County Council
Travelling Expenses of Members of Inspection Committees, Payment of.
References to, in Debate on Education (England and Wales) Bill, Nov. 13, 888, 894.

London Water Bill
Amendments, Daily Printing of.
Q. Nov. 4, 14.
Commissioners, Remuneration of.
Q. Nov. 7, 385.
Date of resuming Debate.
Q. Nov. 11, 588.

London Water Supply
Population and Rateable Value of Boroughs—Statement Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258.
Return Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1105.

Londonderry
Assize—Holding North-West Winter Assize in Londonderry, proposed.
Q. Nov. 11, 596.
Donegal and Londonderry Union Boundaries, Change of—Date of Local Government Board Inquiry.
Q. Nov. 13, 877.
Post Office.
Officials, Supervision by Relatives—Case of Londonderry Postmaster's Daughter.
Q. Nov. 19, 1360.
Sunday Morning Delivery—Resolution from Londonderry Corporation.
Q. Nov. 12, 755.
Shipbuilding Yard—Inspection of by the Admiralty, Placing on Admiralty List, etc.
Q. Nov. 12, 758.
Telephone Service, Establishment of Trunk Telephone from Belfast to Londonderry—Post Office requiring Guarantee
Q. Nov. 17, 1109.

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 7*, 417; *Nov. 12*, 836, 837, 842; *Nov. 13*, 883, 885, 886, 902, 903, 905, 906, 907, 909, 910, 911, 914, 917, 924, 926, 927, 933, 935, 936, 947, 953; *Nov. 17*, 1172, 1195, 1197.
Government Departmental Powers, Transfer to County Councils—Provisions of the Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill, *Nov. 6*, 272.

[*cont.*

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter—*cont.*
- Islington Parish Church Bells, Ringing on King's Birthday—Auditor disallowing Cost, *Nov. 17*, 1122.
- Small Dwellings Acquisition Act—Number of Applications for Loans, *Nov. 5*, 140.
- Vaccination Exemption Certificates, Number granted, *Nov. 5*, 140.
- Workhouse Nursing Staffs and Masters and Matrons, Differences between—Committee, Date of Report, *Nov. 4*, 9.

Longford
- Board of Guardians—Contract given to Members of the United Irish League, alleged.
  Q. Nov. 6, 275.
- Fair Rent Applications, Number pending—Date of next Sub-Commission Sitting.
  Q. Nov. 11, 599.
- Mutoscopes—Nature of Pictures Exhibited, Police Supervision proposed.
  Q. Nov. 12, 752.
- Registry of Titles—Registering Titles a second time under New Rules, etc.
  Q. Nov. 17, 1125.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
- Africa, South—Financial Assistance to the Boers, Conference between Colonial Secretary and Boer Generals, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1352.
- Ireland.
  - Armagh Income Tax Appeals—Holding Sittings at Armagh instead of Portadown proposed, *Nov. 12*, 758.
  - Monaghan—Working of the Local Government Act, Inquiry proposed, *Nov. 13*, 866.
- Morocco, Kabyle Revolt—Steps taken to protect British Interests, *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice of England
Baron Alverstone.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Dudley.

Lord President of the Council
Duke of Devonshire.

Lord's Day Observance Act
- Dartmouth, Prosecution of Mr. J. Scannell.
  Q. Nov. 17, 1121.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
- Aliens charged at Metropolitan Police Courts, Number during last year, *Nov. 19*, 1358.
- Business of the House—London Water Bill, *Nov. 4*, 15.
- Canadian Exports of Bounty-fed Iron and Steel—Quantity Imported into Great Britain, etc., *Nov. 4*, 8, 9.
- Colonial Conference in London—Omission of Speeches of the Colonial Premiers from the Blue Book, *Nov. 6*, 267.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 4*, 70, 71, 72, 118.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 727.
- Municipal Trading, Effect on the Rates, *Nov. 17*, 1130.
- Sugar Bounties.
  - Brussels Convention—Communications from the Belgian Government Extension of time for Ratification, etc., *Nov. 6*, 270.
  - Ontario Bounty on Beet Sugar, Rate of, *Nov. 6*, 271.
- Telephone Service.
  - Post Office System — Subscribers put into Communication with National Telephone Co. Subscribers, *Nov. 19*, 1360.
  - Tunbridge Wells—Purchase of Municipal Telephone Service by National Telephone Co., Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk, *Nov. 11*, 602, 603.
- Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, Grant-in-aid.
  - Allocation of Grant to Loyalists, etc. *Nov. 6*, 340, 343, 346.
  - Cost of Animals for re-stocking Farms, *Nov. 5*, 137.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. [Kent, Thanet]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 805.
- Newfoundland, Treaty with United States binding the Colony not to accord Preferential Tariff for Empire Products, *Nov. 13*, 865.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means.*
- Amendments—Education Bill.
  - Agricultural Rates Act and Tithe Rent Charge Act—Amendments to, were out of order, *Nov. 13*, 912, 913.
  - Alternative Amendments — If the words of the original Clause could be struck out, the Member could move alternative words, *Nov. 17*, 1172.
  - Amendments did not read, *Nov. 5*, 181,
  - Amendments in the wrong place *Nov. 5*, 181, 182, 209.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
Amendments—*cont.*
Amendments raising same points, *Nov. 5*, 209.
Definition Clause—Both the second and fifth sub-sections were definitions, and that being so the Amendment was out of Order, *Nov. 14*, 1065.
Expenditure—Amount to be raised by Rates and Parliamentary Grants —If the Member went on to say that Parliamentary Grant should be increased in order to meet the new charges under the Bill, he would not be in Order, *Nov. 12*, 795, 796.
Increase in Grant—The words of the Amendment were the converse of what the Member desired to move, but his position was, that as he could not move a reduction, he had to move an increase, *Nov. 17*, 1164.
It was possible that the words of the Amendment were better than the words of the Amendment which had been rejected—It was not, however, for the Chairman to choose, *Nov. 18*, 1260.
Notice of Amendments—It was sufficient notice that the Clause should appear on the Paper—What was understood by Notice was that it must be in the hands of Members, and that it should not be produced at the last moment, *Nov. 17*, 1201.
Persons other than the Local Education Authority could say that they were prepared to provide a new School, but that was not a duty under the Elementary Education Acts, therefore the words proposed could not be inserted in the way proposed, *Nov. 4*, 71.
Points already settled, *Nov. 4*, 71; *Nov. 14*, 1065; *Nov. 18*, 1289, 1477.
Amendment raised the point which had been discussed for two days, *Nov. 18*, 1259, 1260.
Premature Amendments—The proposal before the Committee was that certain words be left out—The best plan would be to move the Amendment as an Amendment to a proposal which the Government would bring forward later, *Nov. 6*, 307.
Clauses—Education Bill.
Endowments Question was a fitting one to be dealt with in a separate clause, and by General Agreement the Question of Endowment was to be brought up as a new Clause, *Nov. 17*, 1200.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
Clauses—*cont.*
Government Clauses would be taken and continued till completed and then Private Members' Clauses were to be proceeded with until the hour of Eleven. If before that hour all Clauses were disposed of the Schedules were to be proceeded with—If at Eleven o'clock there still remained some Private Members' Clauses discussion would close and the Schedules would be taken, *Nov. 19*, 1466.
Private Members Clauses would be taken in the Order they appeared on the Paper, *Nov. 19*, 1467.
Twelfth Clause—Discussion of powers to compel Education Authority to carry out its Duties by a *Mandamus* would depend on the relations which would be established between the Local Authority and Education Committee, *Nov. 4*, 119.
Division Challenged—Education Bill, *Nov. 5*, 171; *Nov. 12*, 832.
Financial Resolution, Education Bill—Opportunity for discussion in Committee Stage of Government proposals, *Nov. 14*, 1092, 1093.
Irrelevant Observations—Education Bill, *Nov. 6*, 283, 284, 291.
Repetition in Debate—The Quotation had already been given once or twice, *Nov. 6*, 326.

Loyd, Mr. A. K. [Berks, Abingdon]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov 7*, 432, 433, 434; *Nov. 17*, 1202.

Lunatic Asylums
Broadmoor—Patient inflicting injuries on Attendant, Precautions.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1121.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Limerick Road Labour Scheme, *Nov. 17*. 1113.

Lurgan
Post Office — Insanitary Condition of Temporary premises, Delay in erection of new Post Office, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 273.

Lynch, Mr. Arthur
Arrest of—Number of Remands, Date of resuming Trial, etc.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1230.

Lyttelton, Mr. A. [Warwick and Leamington]
Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 850.

M'Arthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 727.
French Congo Concessionaire Companies' Exclusive Trading Rights, Effect on Interests of British Traders—Representations to the French Government, *Nov. 19*, 1357.
St. John's Church Day Schools, Sutton-on-Plym—Ritualistic Practices at, *Nov. 18*, 1236.
United States Mail Service—Discontinuance of accelerated mail train service in connection with mid-week mails *via* Queenstown, *Nov. 18*, 1234.

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. E. [Antrim, S.]
Ireland.
Dungannon—Expenses of Extra Police, *Nov. 17*. 1114.
Game Licences—Precautions taken to ensure compliance with the Law, Evasions in King's County, alleged, *Nov. 19*, 1348.

Macauley, Mr. J.
Disloyal Speech at Belfast—Government action.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 880.

Macedonia
Reforms, Attitude of the Powers—Bulgarian Prime Minister's Statement.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 271.

McIloy, Mr.
Appointment as Member of the Scottish Fishery Board, Qualifications.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 751.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 12*, 813.

M'Kenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*. 16, 54, 71, 74, 115; *Nov. 5*, 167, 179, 181; *Nov. 6*, 281, 284, 311, 326; *Nov. 12*, 791. 830; *Nov. 17*, 1154, 1169, 1171, 1172, 1190, 1200, 1222, 1223; *Nov. 18*, 1269, 1284, 1323.
Schoolmasters' Houses, Public claim to use of Houses jointly with School Trustees, etc., *Nov. 13*, 858.
Small Dwellings Acquisition Act—Number of applications for Loans, Number sanctioned, *Nov. 5*, 140; *Nov. 12*, 743.
Uganda Railway—Locomotive Contracts given to American Firms, *Nov. 12*, 743.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 15, 25, 49, 73; *Nov. 5*, 162, 191; *Nov. 6*, 323, 324; *Nov. 12*, 806, 809, 112; *Nov. 13*, 952, 953, 962; *Nov. 14*, 1038, 1055, 1056 10 7, 1059, 1064; *Nov. 17*, 1148, 1172, 1173, 1177, 1184; *Nov. 18*, 1246, 1270, 1317, 1318; *Nov. 19*, 1386, 1387, 1449, 1461, 1462.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 640.
Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1140.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, Ireland
Irish Language—Appointment of Magistrates having a knowledge of the Irish Language, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1237.
Macauley's, Mr. J., Disloyal Speech at Belfast—Government Action.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 880.
Roscrea—Appointment of Additional Justices, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

"Magnificent," H.M.S.
Able Seamen and Boys, Proportion carried.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 270.

Mail Service
Canadian Mail Service with Great Britain—Sligo as a Port of Call, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.
China—Superiority of the Overland Route to Mail Steamships.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 869.
Contracts—Date of Termination of P. and O. and Orient Contracts.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 869.
United States—Discontinuance of accelerated mail train service in connection with mid-week mails *via* Queenstown.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1234.

Maine, State of
Agricultural Report Presented, *Nov. 10* 449.

Majority Rule
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 11*, 693, 707; Mr. Asquith, 710.

Malcolm, Mr. Ian [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 19*, 1370, 1377, 1413, 1440.
Rumbold, Sir H.—Publication of Reminiscences, *No. 13*, 871.

Malicious Injuries, Ireland
Compensation for—Case of Mr. R. Sproule.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 274.

Mall to Charing Cross
New Street, Date of beginning Work.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1122.

Malta
Garrison Regiments—Official Reports as to Conduct and Efficiency of,
Q. *Nov. 12*, 746.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincoln, Spalding]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill.
    Contracts with School Boards—Position of Members of Education Committees interested in Contracts, *Nov. 13*, 860.
    Managers of Non-provided Schools—Principle of Appointment, *Nov. 18*, 1229.
    Teachers and Membership of Municipal Bodies, *Nov. 6*, 266.
    School Buildings.
      Alterations and Repairs, Definition of Term, *Nov. 18*, 1229.
      Requirements of the Education Authority, Form of Agreement, *Nov. 18*, 1229.
    Voluntary Schools—Appropriation of Credit Balances in hands of Managers, *Nov. 13*, 860.
  Horses for the Army—Type of Horses required—Leaflet to Farmers and Horsebreeders, *Nov. 11*, 594.

Marine Works (Ireland) Act
  Moneys voted under—Delay in allocation of.
    Q. *Nov. 10*, 464; *Nov. 18*, 1231.

Mather, Sir W. [Lancashire, Rossendale]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov 5*, 170, 180; *Nov. 12*, 786; *Nov. 14*, 1048.

May, Sir Erskine.
  Supply Procedure—Procedure to be followed in the Case of Emergencies necessitating New Expenditure after the close of Committee of Supply.
    O. Mr. Ritchie, *Nov. 4*, 108.

Mayo
  County Council Printing Contract given to Member of the United Irish League.
    Q. *Nov. 6*, 275.

Medals
  South African War.
    Dates of Service, Effect of Regulations on Auxiliary Forces and Colonial Troops, etc.
      Q. *Nov. 17*, 1118; *Nov. 19*, 1353.
    Transport Officers, Medals for—Exclusion of Masters of Mail Steamers.
      Q. *Nov. 17*, 1105.
    Yeomanry Battalions sent to South Africa in 1902—Granting Medal proposed.
      Q. *Nov. 19*, 1354.

Medical Officers, Ireland
  Dispensary Medical Officers.
    Emyvale Medical Officer, Reduction of Salary below sum arranged by Local Authority.
      Q. *Nov. 13*, 867.

Medical Officers, Ireland—*cont.*
  Dispensary Medical Officers—*cont.*
    Reform, Need for—Opinion of the President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland.
      Q. *Nov. 6*, 275.
    Salaries, Raising.
      Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.
  Poor Law Medical Officers, Disqualification as County Councillors.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

Mediterranean
  British Government entering into Reciprocal Agreement with Foreign Power—Statement, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Mediterranean Fleet
  Names of Vessels forming Fleet in June, 1901, and Nov., 1902—Stores and Coal Requirements.
    Q. *Nov. 11*, 588.

Members of Parliament
  Imprisonment of Irish Members *see* Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party.
  Lynch, Mr. A., Arrest of—Number of Remands, Date of resuming Trial, etc.
    Q. *Nov. 18*, 1230.

Mercantile Marine
  Aggregate Tonnage, Annual Clearances, Annual Value of Exports and Imports—Return Presented, *Nov. 14*, 1033.
  Freight—South African Shipping Lines Notification of Increase in Rate of Freight to Traders, Powers of the Board of Trade to intervene.
    Qs. *Nov. 10*, 459, 460.
  Seamen—Return of Number, Ages, Ratings, and Nationalities of Seamen employed, Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Metropolitan Police
  Greatcoats, Regulations as to wearing.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1358.
  Perjury, Case of Ex-Constable Rolls—Dismissal of Second Constable from the Force.
    Q. *Nov. 4*, 7.

Metropolitan Police Courts
  Aliens charged at—Number during the last year.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.

Metropolitan Water Area
  Population and Rateable Value of Boroughs—Statement Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 17*, 1105.

Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. [Stafford, Handsworth]
  Africa, South—Labour Supply, A plentiful Labour Supply the one thing necessary for the happiness of South Africa, *Nov. 5*, 222, 223.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 17*, 1154.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 6*, 305; *Nov. 18*, 1260.
Middleton Guardians
  Board-room used for Political Meetings—Proceedings by the Crown, Precedent for Legal Proceedings.
    Q. *Nov. 10*, 463.
Militia
  Cost—Average Annual Cost of Militiamen.
    Q. *Nov. 7*, 385.
  Officers enlisting in the Army to serve in South Africa—Granting Army Commissions to proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 6*, 267; *Nov. 18*, 1240.
  Recruiting.
    Physical Standards, Alterations in.
      Q. *Nov. 19*, 1351.
    Statistics since the Conclusion of the South African War.
      Q. *Nov. 19*, 1351.
  Strength and Recruiting Statistics.
    Q. *Nov. 12*, 745.
Militia and Yeomanry Bill
  c. 2R. *Nov. 10*, 578.
Milner, Vis.
  Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
    Compensation for War Losses—Scale of Compensation for Burghers and Loyalists.
      O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Nov. 5*, 245.
    Farms, Purchase of, from the Boers—Taking Advantage of present Necessities to force Sale of Farms.
      O. Sir R. Reid, *Nov. 5*, 213.
Milvain, Mr. T. [Hampstead]
  Education (England Wales) Bill *com.*, *Nov. 13*, 887.
Monaghan
  Constabulary, Number doing town Duty—Religious Denominations of Constables.
    Q. *Nov. 4*, 13.
  Local Government Act, Working of—Inquiry proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 866.
Money Orders
  Telegraphic Money Orders containing Instructions as to Bets, Preventing use of Telegraph Service for Gambling Transactions.
    Q. *Nov. 5*, 131.
  Turkey—Rates of Commission on British and French Money Orders.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1346.
Monmouth, County of
  Census—Return Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1346.
Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]
  Indian Finance—Transfer of Items of Charge to the Imperial Exchequer, Cost of the India Office, etc., *Nov, 10*, 513, 515.
Morgan, Mr. D. J. [Essex, Walthamstow]
  Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 17*, 1163.
Morgan, Mr. Lloyd [Carmarthen, W.]
  Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 5*, 182.
Morocco
  Kabyle Revolt—Steps taken to protect British Interests.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1357.
Morrell, Mr. J. H. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill.
    Position of Non-aided Church Schools, *Nov. 10*, 452.
  Poor Law Officers—Superannuation.
    Establishment of Central Fund, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 262.
Moses, Mr.
  Cotton Industry of Bombay, Condition of
    O. Mr. Emmott, *Nov. 10*, 561.
Moss, Mr. S. [Denbighshire, E.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill. *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 349; *Nov. 12*, 771; *Nov. 19*, 1388.
Motions—Parliamentary Procedure
  Abstract Motions which used to be put on Tuesday and Friday, Abandonment owing to elaborate Discussion of Supply.
    O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 516.
Mountain Artillery
  Officers receiving lower pay than Officers of Garrison Artillery.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 865.
Msichoke, Slave Girl
  Report of British Agent at Zanzibar.
    Q *Nov. 11*, 586.
Muldowney, Michael
  Complicity in the Craughwell Murder—Date of Release.
    Q. *Nov. 18*, 1238.
Municipal Trading
  Royal Commission—Appointment proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 17*, 1129.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Lord Advocate* [Buteshire]
  Clyde, Port Local Authority—Glasgow Corporation Application, Laying Report upon the Table, *Nov. 17*, 1123.
  Congested Districts—Population, Valuation, etc., Granting Return, *Nov. 4*, 11.
  Deer Forests.
    Ben Wyvis, Converting Grazings on Southern Slope into Deer Forest, *Nov. 5*, 142.
    Glastullich Farm, Adding to Rhidorroch Deer Forest, etc., *Nov. 4*, 10.

[*cont.*

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*
- Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill, *intro.*, *Nov. 12*, 760.
- Fisheries — Protection against Illegal Trawling, Additional Cruisers, *Nov. 4*, 12.
- Fishery Board.
  - Appointment of Mr. McIloy as Member, Qualifications, *Nov. 12*, 751.
  - Cruisers placed at disposal of the Board during withdrawal of the "Jackall," *Nov. 5*, 143.
- Lewis, Island of.
  - Aird School Playground—Erection of Shelter for use in bad weather, *Nov. 18*, 1234.
  - Destitution among Cottars and Fishermen, Acquisition of Land by Congested Districts Board, proposed, *Nov.* 5, 142.
  - Fisheries—Provision of Gunboat as protection against Trawlers, *Nov. 11*, 595 ; *Nov. 12*, 750.
  - Hospitals—Additional Accommodation for Infectious Diseases, *Nov. 11*, 595 ; *Nov. 12*, 748, 749
  - Local Government Board Inspection—Report on Sanitary Condition, etc., *Nov. 18*, 1234.
  - Ness District—Death from Typhus at, Insanitary Condition of House, etc., *Nov. 12*, 750.
  - Social Condition of the People—Special Report of Crofters Commission, *Nov. 18*, 1233.
  - Tolsta School, Number of Pupils, etc., *Nov. 13*, 874.
- Roads.
  - Applecross — Construction of Road and Bridge, Refusal of the Congested Districts Board to provide Grant-in-Aid, *Nov. 12*, 749.
  - Ross—Road Construction in Mid. Ross, Insufficiency of Grant, alleged.
    Q. *Nov. 12*, 748.

Mutoscopes
- Longford—Nature of pictures exhibited, Police Supervision, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 12*, 752.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
- Ireland—
  - Dublin Post Office.
    - Officers employed on Split Duties not having nine hours at home, *Nov. 5*, 130.
    - Sanitary Authority, *Nov. 5*, 131.
    - Triple Attendance, Overtime Payments, *Nov. 5*, 130.
    - Vacancies in Sorting Office Staff, Date of filling up, *Nov. 6*, 260.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Edgeworthstown Postmastership—Name, Salary, and Nationality of Telegraphist appointed, *Nov. 6*, 259.
  - Newbridge Postmastership—Qualification of Officer appointed, Advertisement of Appointment in Post Office Circular, etc., *Nov. 6*, 260.

Natal
- Loyalists, Compensation for War Losses—Question of inclusion in Grant to Transvaal and Orange River Loyalists.
  Observations in Committee of Supply, *Nov. 5*, 224, 225, 239 ; *Report of Supply*, 343.

National School Teachers, Ireland.
- Drogheda—St. Mary's National School, Head Teacher losing £50 a year owing to Commissioners' interpretation of New Rules.
  Qs. *Nov. 5*, 147 ; *Nov. 13*, 879.
- Salaries—Monthly Payment, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 17*, 1127.

Navy

First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

- Administration by the Admiralty—Royal Commission proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 13*, 882.
- Ammunition — Practice Ammunition thrown overboard, alleged.
  Q. *Nov. 6*, 269.
- Appropriation Accounts, Expediting delivery to Comptroller and Auditor-General.
  Q. *Nov, 19*, 1366.
- Boilers.
  - "Diadem"—Boiler Repairs, Date of completion, etc.
    Q. *Nov. 17*, 1118.
  - Return of Oct. 17th, 1902—Expenses for Alterations and Additions with regard to Ships mentioned in Return.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 861.
  - "Terrible," Repairs—Laying List upon the Table.
    Q. *Nov. 17*, 1119.
- Channel Fleet, Proportion of Able Seamen and Boys in—Proportion on board H.M.S. "Magnificent."
  Q. *Nov. 6*, 270.
- Coal.
  - New Zealand Coal, Kind of Coal supplied to the China Squadron.
    Qs. *Nov. 13*, 867 ; *Nov. 17th* 1105 ; *Nov. 18*, 1238, 1239.
  - Welsh and New Zealand Coal, Comparisons between—Price, Amount carried on Ships of War, etc.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1355.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
- Committees on Manning, Reserves, etc.—Date of Reports.
  - *Q. Nov.* 5, 133.
- Contracts, Armour plate — Ship-building Programme for 1901 - 02.
  - Date of placing Orders.
    - *Q. Nov. 4*, 6.
  - Issue of Specifications.
    - *Q. Nov. 4*, 5.
- "Cressy," H.M.S.—Speed Trials, Report.
  - *Q. Nov. 19*, 1356.
- Expenditure, Aggregate Expenditure on Seagoing Force—Return Presented, *Nov. 14*, 1033.
- Firing Matches—Regulations as to use of the Slow Match.
  - *Q. Nov. 6*, 262.
- "Good Hope," Route arranged for Mr. Chamberlain's Tour — Cost of the "Good Hope," etc.
  - *Q. Nov. 11*, 589.
- "Hyacinth," H.M.S. — Defects in Machinery, Experiments with screws, etc.
  - *Q. Nov. 19*, 1356.
- India's Contribution compared with that of the Colonies.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *Nov. 10*, 511 ; Lord G. Hamilton, 519.
- "Magnificent," H.M.S. — Proportion of able Seamen and Boys, carried.
  - *Q. Nov. 6*, 270.
- Mediterranean Fleet—Names of Vessels forming Fleet, in June, 1901, and Nov. 1902.
  - *Q. Nov. 11*, 588.
- Ordnance Department Vacancies—Claims of Warrant Officers.
  - *Q. Nov. 17*, 1112.
- Pensioners re-engaged — Modification of Terms proposed.
  - *Q. Nov. 12*, 742.
- Pensions of Chief Petty Officers, Increase in.
  - *Q. Nov. 11*, 589.
- Salutes—Number of Accidents during last ten years.
  - *Q. Nov. 12*, 741.
- Seamen, Cost of training.
  - *Q. Nov. 18*, 1228.
- "Terrible," H.M.S.—Christmas Leave of Crew.
  - *Q. Nov. 18*, 1228.
- Transport Service, *see* that title.

Ness
- Harbour of Port of Ness, Condition of—Report, Selection of Engineer.
  - *Qs. Nov. 17*, 1107 ; *Nov. 19*, 1348.
- Insanitary Condition of Houses—Death of Mackay from Typhus.
  - *Q. Nov. 12*, 750.

New Members Sworn
- Samuel, Mr. H. L.—for County of Yorkshire (North Riding), *Nov. 7*, 381.
- Taylor, Mr. A.—for Borough of Liverpool (East Toxteth Division), *Nov. 11*, 604.

New Palace Yard
- Lighting, Improvement in.
  - *Q. Nov. 11*, 596.

New Zealand Coal
- China Squadron, Kind of Coal supplied to.
  - *Qs. Nov. 13*, 867 ; *Nov. 17*, 1105 ; *Nov. 18*, 1238, 1239.
- Comparisons with Welsh Coal as to bulk Effectiveness in developing Steam, etc.
  - *Q. Nov. 19*, 1355.

Newbridge
- Artisans' Cottages—Board of Works refusing to issue final Instalment of Loan, alleged.
  - *Q. Nov. 19*, 1362.
- Postmastership—Qualifications of Officer appointed, Advertisement of Appointment in Post Office Circular, etc.
  - *Q. Nov. 6*, 260.

Newfoundland
- Treaty with United States binding the Colony not to accord Preferential Tariff for Empire Products, alleged.
  - *Q. Nov. 13*, 865.

Newry
- Railway Accident—Notification to the Board of Trade.
  - *Q. Nov. 12*, 757.

Nicol, Mr D. N. [Argyle]
- Port Ellen Mail Delays, *Nov. 13*, 858.

Norfolk
- South Norfolk Light Railways Amendment Order Presented, *Nov 10*, 451 ; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

North Sea Fisheries
- Investigation, International Scheme—Contributions of various Countries, etc.
  - *Qs. Nov. 4*, 8 ; *Nov. 5*, 135.

North-West Railway Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Northampton, County of
- Census—Return Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1346.

Norton, Capt. C. W. [Newington, W.]
- Army.
  - Commissions — Granting to Militia Officers enlisting in the Army to serve in South Africa, *Nov. 6*, 267 ; *Nov. 18*, 1240.
  - Sandhurst Military College — Safe distribution of Letters, Arrangements for cashing crossed Cheques, etc., *Nov. 10*, 457.
- Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum — Patient inflicting Injuries on Attendant, Precautions, *Nov. 17*, 1121.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Trust Deeds, Preventing execution of Sham Trust Deeds, *Nov. 19*, 1364.

[*cont.*

Norton, Capt. C. W.—*cont.*
Income Tax—Employers furnishing list of their employees liable for Income Tax, *Nov. 18*, 1241.
Indian Army.
Colonels of the Native Army—No promotion to rank of Major-General since Oct., 1900, *Nov. 17*, 1120.
Lancers, 9th—Conduct at Sialkote, Indiscriminate Punishment, *Nov. 17*, 1120.
"Parliamentary Debates"—New Contract, Laying on the Table of the House, *Nov. 10*, 453.
Woolwich Arsenal.
Wages of Workmen in Danger Buildings—Infringement of Fair Wages Resolution, *Nov. 5*, 139.
Williams, Lieut.-Col. A. B., holding dual position of Collector of Income Tax and Paymaster to the Royal Arsenal, *Nov. 10*, 457.

Nuns
Dublin Custom House, Nuns begging Alms, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 13.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
Telegraph Service Employees, Male Clerks placed under control of Women Supervisors — Abolition of Practice, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1109.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, N.]
Army Medical Corps Officers serving in India—Relief Programme, Exclusion of Officers with less than six years' service in India, *Nov. 10*, 456.
Ireland.
Carndonagh.
Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Surplus Profit — Enforcing Section 5 of Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883, *Nov. 13*, 873, 874.
Carndonagh — Calduff Railway, Extension of — Government Grant-in-aid, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1231.
Letters, Delay in delivery, *Nov. 13*, 881.
Donegal Coast, Removal of Wreckage, *Nov. 12*, 757.
Greenan — Preservation of Ancient Buildings, *Nov. 17*, 1113.
Local Government Auditors' Examinations, Rules as to Second Nomination, etc., *Nov. 11*, 598.
Londonderry.
Donegal and Londonderry Union Boundaries, Change in—Date of Local Government Board Inquiry, *Nov. 13*, 877.

O'Doherty, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Londonderry—*cont.*
Postal Arrangements, Sunday Morning Delivery—Resolution from Londonderry Corporation, *Nov. 12*, 755, 756.
Shipbuilding Yard — Inspection by the Admiralty, Placing on the Admiralty list, etc., *Nov. 12*, 758.
Ordnance Survey Memoirs, Custody of MSS. — Printing proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1112.
Port Erlin Boat Slip, Arrangements for Construction of, *Nov. 12*, 759.
Railways, State Purchase of — Appointment of Royal Commission of Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1232.
Tramways Acts, Amendment proposed—Publication of Report of Public Works Commissioners, *Nov. 11*, 598.
Marine Works (Ireland) Act—Allocation of Moneys voted, *Nov. 10*, 464; *Nov.* 18, 1231.

O'Donnell, John
Royal Irish Constabulary, Refusal of Admission as Recruit.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 145.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Sneem Licensing Case—Police opposing licence of Mary Doyle, *Nov.* 17, 1115.

O'Keeffe v. Walsh
Tallow Conspiracy Case—Charge of the Lord Chief Baron, Breach of Public Trust by Officials, alleged.
Qs. *Nov.* 17, 1128; *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Omagh
Barracks — Increasing Accommodation and Number of Troops, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 6*, 268, 269.

Ontario
Bounties on Beet Sugar Exports, Rate of —Exports to the United Kingdom.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 271.

Orange River Colony
Administration, etc., *see* Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

Ordnance Department, Naval
Vacancies, Claims of Warrant Officers.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1112.

Ordnance Survey
Ireland—Custody of MSS. of Memoirs, Printing proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1112.

Orient Steamship Co.
Mail Contracts, Date of Termination.
Q, *Nov. 13*, 869.

Osborne Estate Bill
c. 2R., *Nov 10*, 583.

Osborne Estate Bill
Excerpt from Queen Victoria's Will—Laying on the Table, proposed.
Q. Nov. 18, 1241.

Pacific Cable
Rates between England and Australasia.
Q. Nov. 13, 859.

Palace Yard
Lighting of New Palace Yard, Improvement in.
Q. Nov. 11, 596.

Palmer, Mr. W. [Salisbury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 6*, 355.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Trade within the Empire—Publication of Annual Compendium, *Nov. 6*, 259.
Volunteer Drill in Richmond Park, Government setting apart increased areas. *Nov. 11*, 595, 596.

Parks
Refusal of Concessions to Local Authorities, etc.
Q. Nov. 7, 382.

Parliament
House of Commons
New Members Sworn, *see* that title.
Public Petitions Committee Report Presented, *Nov. 5*, 151.
Indian Affairs, Facilities for Discussion, Responsibility of Parliament, etc., *see* India.
Lighting of the Precincts of the Houses of Parliament, Improvement in.
Q. Nov. 11, 596.

Parliamentary Control
Decreasing Authority of the House of Commons and increasing Power and Authority of the Ministry.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 96.
Finance — Appropriation Act the Sole Guarantee of Parliamentary Control over National Finances — Amount raised by Permanent Taxation over which the House has no other control, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 87, 95.

"Parliamentary Debates"
Contract for publishing Reports of Debates, etc.—Laying on the Table of the House.
Q. Nov. 10, 453.

Parliamentary Procedure
Abstract Motions on Tuesday and Friday, Abandonment of, owing to present elaborate Discussion of Supply.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 516.

Parliamentary Procedure—*cont.*
Bills.
Carrying over partly considered Bills from one Session to another, Merits and demerits of proposal, as a method of expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 616.
Conduct of—Criticism of Minister in charge of Education (England and Wales) Bill for making a Political Speech outside the House.
O. Mr. J. Ellis, *Nov 11*, 657.
Closure, *see* that title.
New Rules, Results of.
Facilities for business not increased, Nothing done to check disorder, etc.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Nov. 11*, 629; Mr. Chaplin, 633, 634.
Supply—Advantage of the new Procedure Rule permitting Arrangement of Time and of Order of Votes.
O. Mr. P. Smith, *Nov. 11*, 645.
Supply (*see* that title).

Parliamentary Register
Scotland—Number of persons removed from Register in 1901 for non-payment of Rates, Return.
Q. Nov. 17, 1107.

Parliamentary Time
Waste of—Tendency to talk too much, Newspapers ceasing to report the Debates of the House, etc.
O. Mr. Wanklyn, *Nov. 11*, 659.

Party System
Majority Rule.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 11*, 693, 707; Mr. Asquith, 710.

Patent Law Amendment Bill
l. 2R., *Nov. 17*, 1099.

Patents
Colonial Laws, Fees—Return proposed.
Q. Nov. 11, 586.
Rule Amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents' Rules Presented *Nov. 5*, 129; *Nov. 17*, 1098.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 181, 182, 193; *Nov. 6*, 293, 294.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Education Committee—Delegation of work to Local Committees, *Nov. 18* 1230.

Peking
British Post Office, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1110.

Pembroke Urban Council
Explosives, Bye-laws as to—Local Government Board Sanction.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 466.

Penal Servitude
Conditional Licence Granted, *Nov. 18*, 1225, 1227.

Pencils
Foreign-made Pencils, Use in Government Offices—Orders to Home Manufacturers, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 143; *Nov. 10*, 461; *Nov. 14*, 1035.

Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Co.
Mail Contracts, Date of Termination.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 869.

Percy, Earl—*Under-Secretary of State for India* [Kensington, S.]
India.
Army, British Government proposals of Feb., 1902—Observations of the Viceroy, etc., Date of circulating Papers, *Nov. 4*, 7.
Government Liquor Traffic, Administration of the Excise Department, Assam Tea-planters' Complaints, etc.—Reply to Mr. Caine's Charges, *Nov. 10*, 538, 543, 544, 546.

Perjury
Rolls, ex-Constable, Conviction of—Dismissal of Second Constable from the Force.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 7.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov.* 7, 402, 403.

Persian Gulf
Piracy, Suppression of—India Contribution to Navy Expenditure given in Payment of a definite Service.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 519.

Petitions, Public
Committee Report Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130.

Phthisis
Cornish Miners, Phthisis among—Nature of Home Office Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 133.
Ireland, Spread of the Disease—Provision of Sanatoria.
Q. *Nov 13*, 866.

Philippine Islands
Silver Standard, Continuance of—Effect on Indian Commercial Interests in China.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 459.

Philipps, Mr. J. W. [Pembroke]
Civil Service Examinations—Scale of Fees, *Nov. 18*, 1227.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 18*, 812.

Philipps, Mr. J. W.—*cont*
Great Western Railway — Breakdown near Carmarthen, Board of Trade Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 14*, 1035.

Piers and Harbours
Ireland—Fishery Piers, Return Presented, *Nov. 7*, 381.
Scotland—Grants-in-Aid, Names of places for which Grants were refused.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1347.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Army.
Army Corps, 1st and 2nd—Number of Effective men, *Nov. 13*, 864.
Entrance Examinations — Placing Cavalry and Infantry on an Equal Footing, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1232.
"Britannic" Transport — Number of Troops embarked from South Africa for Australia on 7th July, Number of Deaths, *Nov. 17*, 1116.
Cape Parliament, Members of — British Officer's fraudulent attempts to obtain Evidence of Malpractices, *Nov. 14*, 1036.

Platt-Higgins, Mr. F. (Salford, N.)
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 19*, 1440.

Plummer, Mr. W. R. (Newcastle-on-Tyne)
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 7*, 438.

Plymtree, Devon
Schoolroom, Refusal of use for Political Meetings — Withdrawal of Parliamentary Grant, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1236, 1237.

Police
Licensing Act, 1902—Police assisting Publicans to keep the Law.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 4.
Metropolitan Police — Regulations as to wearing Greatcoats.
Q. *Nov.*, 1358.
Perjury, Case of Ex-Constable Rolls—Dismissal of Second Constable from the Force.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 7.

Police Courts, Metropolitan
Aliens Charged at—Number during the last year.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1358.

Poor Law Children
Ireland—Boards refusing permission to Lady Inspector to examine Boarded-out-Children, Appointment of Roman Catholic Additional Inspector.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1127.
Village Communities—Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children accommodated, Cost per head per Annum, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 261.

Poor Law Infirmaries
Differences between Nursing Staffs and Masters and Matrons — Committee, Date of Report.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 9.

Poor Law Medical Officers, Ireland
County Councillors, Disqualification of Dispensary Doctors.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

Poor Law Officers
Superannuation.
Central Fund, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 262 ; *Nov. 19*, 1349
Compulsory Retirement at the Age of 65—Enforcing retiring Section of the Act.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1349.
Ireland—Limitation of Liability of Ratepayers — Legislation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 277.

Poor Law Unions, Ireland
Amalgamation of Unions, Investigations.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 880.
Clerks, Transfer of work under the Franchise and Juror Acts to Clerks of Unions, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 465.
Londonderry and Donegal Union Boundaries, Change of--Date of Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 877.

Port Ellen
Mail Delays.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 858.

Port Erlin
Boat Slip—Arrangements for Construction of.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 759.

Port Ness
See Ness.

Post Office
Postmaster General—Mr. A. Chamberlain.
Employees.
Relatives — Supervision of Postal Officials by their Relatives.
Londonderry Case.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1360.
Salisbury Case.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 260.
Telegraph Service, *see* that title.
Welsh Language, Rule as to Officials having a knowledge of—Proportion of English to Welsh speaking People in any Postal District.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 462.
Welsh and Irish speaking Officials, Number of appointments since Jan. 1st 1902.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 870.

Post Office—*cont.*
Ireland.
Carndonagh — Delay in Delivery of Letters.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 881.
Dublin, *see* that title.
Edgeworthstown, Postmastership — Name, Salary and Nationality of Telegraphist appointed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 259.
English and Scottish Postal Officials, Number appointed to Irish Post Offices since Jan. 1st, 1902.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 870.
Irish Language, Non - delivery of Letters and Postcards addressed in Irish-- Appointment in the Post Office of persons having knowledge of the Irish Language proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 6*, 273 ; *Nov. 10*, 463 ; *Nov. 12* ; 756 ; *Nov. 18*, 1237.
Londonderry, Sunday Morning Delivery of Letters — Resolutions from Londonderry Corporation.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 755.
Lurgan Post Office—Insanitary Condition of temporary premises, Delay in Erection of New Post Office etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 273.
Newbridge Postmastership — Qualification of Officer appointed, Advertisement of Appointment in Post Office Circular, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 260.
Relatives, Supervision of Postal Officials by their Relatives—Londonderry Case.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1360.
Jerusalem, Establishment of British Post Office proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1110.
Mail Service, *see* that title.
Money Orders.
Telegraphic Money Orders Containing Instructions as to Bets, Preventing use of Telegraph Service for Gambling Transactions.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 131.
Turkey—Rates of Commission charged on British and French Money Orders.
Q. *Nov. 19*. 1346.
Peking, Establishment of British Post Office proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1110.
Postal Orders.
Orders made payable at a Town or City being payable only at Central Office, Inconveniences of
Q. *Nov. 12*, 742.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Turkey, Supply of Orders at British Post Offices—Rates of Commission on Money Orders, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1346.
Postmasters, *see* that title.
Savings Bank Deposits—Total amount of Interest during 1899, Amount credited to accounts having a Balance over £50.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1347.
Scotland.
Port Ellen, Mail Delays.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 858.
Stornoway Mail Service—Names and Ages of Steamers employed, etc.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 141; *Nov. 18*, 1235.
Telegraph Service, *see* that title.
Telephone Service, *see* that title.

Postal Orders
Orders made payable at a Town or City being payable only at Central Office, Inconvenience of.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 742.
Turkey—Supply of Postal Orders at British Post Offices, Rates of Commission on Money Orders, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1346.

Postmaster-General
Mr. A. Chamberlain.

Postmasters
Howden Cleugh, Resignation of Postmaster — Scale of Remuneration, Length of Service, etc.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 453.
Ireland.
Edgeworthstown Postmastership — Name, Salary, and Nationality of Telegraphist appointed.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 259.
Newbridge Postmastership — Qualifications of Officer appointed, Advertisement of Appointment in Post Office Circular, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 260.

Postmen
Belfast Postmen's Wages, Rate of, compared with Dublin Postmen.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 462.

Poultry
Lewis, Island of—Improvement of Breed of Poultry, Number of Sittings of Eggs provided by the Congested Districts Board.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1348.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 57; *Nov. 5*, 161, 185; *Nov. 6*, 283, 369; *Nov. 7*, 388, 436; *Nov. 13*, 928; *Nov 14*, 1058, 1063; *Nov. 18*, 1243, 1311, 1314; *Nov 19*, 1412, 1451, 1459.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Provision of Evening Elementary Schools, *Nov. 19*, 1360.

Preferential Tariff for Empire Products
Newfoundland Treaty with United States binding Colony not to accept Preferential Tariff, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 865.

Prerogative of the Crown
Honours and Decorations, Distribution of—Advice of Ministers as to exercise of Royal Prerogative.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 466.

Pretyman, Mr. E. G. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Navy.
Boilers.
"Diadem"—Repairs, Date of Completion, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1119.
"Terrible"—Repairs, Laying List upon the Table, *Nov. 17*, 1119.
Coal used by the China Squadron—New Zealand Coal, Quantity of Smoke emitted by, Large proportion of Small Coal, etc., *Nov. 18*, 1239.

Priestley, Mr. A. [Grantham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 675, 677.

Prisons
Carrick-on-Shannon disused Prison, Handing over to Leitrim Agricultural and Technical Committee.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 599.

Public Petitions Committee
Report Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130.

Publicans
Police Assisting Publicans to keep the Law.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 4.
Sunday Trading—Enforcing Lord's Day Observance Act proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1121.

Pym, Mr. C. G. [Bedford]
Transfer of Government Departmental Powers to County Councils — Provisions of the Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill, *Nov. 6*, 272.

Queen Victoria
Excerpt from Will relating to the Osborne Estate—Laying on the Table, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1241.

Railway Servants
Hours of Labour—Case of Guard at Hither Green Station
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Railways
Accidents.
Larbert—Board of Trade Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 872.

[*cont.*

Railways—*cont.*
Accidents—*cont.*
Newry—Notification to the Board of Trade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.
Thames Ironworks Level Crossing—Fatal Accident to Henry Eade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.
Brakes, Side Brakes on Railway Waggons—Result of Meeting of Railway Officials.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.
Carmarthen, Breakdown on Great Western Railway—Board of Trade Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1035.
Ireland.
Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Surplus Profit—Enforcing Section 5 of Tramways (Ireland) Act 1883.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 873.
Carndonagh-Calduff Railway, Extension of Government Grant-in-aid, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1231.
State Purchase--Appointment of Royal Commission of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1232.
Light Railway Orders Presented, *Nov. 10*, 451, 452; *Nov. 17*, 1097.
[For particular Railways, *see* their Names.]

Rankin, Sir J. [Herefordshire, Leominster)
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 14*, 1049.
Evening Continuation Schools--Powers of Local Authorities, Interpretation of Clause 2, *Nov. 19*, 1346.
Rate—Product of the Penny Rate, *Nov. 13*, 881.

Rasch, Major F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
Army.
Reservists, Employment on Civilian Duties—Garrison Artillery Experiment, *Nov, 6*, 269.
Time-expired Men—Age Limit for re-enlistment, *Nov. 6*, 269.
Cottages, Erection of—District Councils' Restrictive Bye-laws, *Nov. 13*, 872.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 826; *Nov. 17*, 1162, 1209.
Indian Army—Conduct of the 9th Lancers at Sialkote, Indiscriminate Punishment, *Nov. 17*, 1119.
South African War—Honours for War Office Officials, *Nov. 17*, 1117.

Rates
Ireland — Number of Rating Appeals, Results.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1363.
Scotland—Number of Persons removed from Parliamentary Register in 1901 for non-payment of Rates, Return.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1107.

Rathcormac
Gaelic Tournament at—Intrusion of the Police.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Records
Historical Manuscripts, *see* that title.
Local Records, Collection and Custody of—Report of Committee with Appendices Presented, *Nov. 10*, 449.

Redmond, Mr. W. [Clare, E.]
Imprisonment of—Communication to the Speaker, *Nov. 6*, 257.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, Grant-in-Aid for expenses consequent upon the Termination of the War—Extent of Devastation in South Africa, Number of Persons still in Concentration Camps, Number of Prisoners returned, etc., *Nov. 5*, 211.

Reservists
See Army.

Revenue and Expenditure
Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom—Expediting Printing and Distribution.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1367.

Rhidorroch Deer Forest
Adding part of Glastullich Farm to the Forest.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 10.

Richards, Mr. H. C. [Finsbury, E.]
Lombard Street, Amalgamation of Parishes, proposed — Vacancy of All Hallows Church, *Nov. 4*, 5.

Richards, Mr. H. M.
Board of Education Inspector, Experience in Public Elementary Schools.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 859.

Richmond Hill (Preservation of View) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Richmond Park
Volunteer Drill, etc., Government setting apart increased areas.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 595.

Riga
Trade Report Presented, *Nov 10*, 449.

Rigg, Mr. R. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Colonial Patent Laws, Fees—Return proposed, *Nov. 11*, 586.
Veterinary Officers who accompanied Remount Officers abroad, Status of, *Nov. 11*, 587.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Croydon]
Africa, South, Vote for—Motion to set up Committee of Supply, *Nov. 4*, 79—Replies to Criticism, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113.

[*cont.*

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*cont.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 12*, 852, 853, 855 ; 3R., *Nov. 17*, 1468.

Income Tax.

Co-operative and Friendly Societies—Payment of Income Tax on Dividends and Profits, *Nov. 18*, 1242.

Employers furnishing a list of their Employees liable for Income Tax, *Nov. 18*, 1241.

Osborne Estate Bill, Excerpt from Queen Victoria's Will—Laying on the Table, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1242.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Grant-in-Aid—Allocation of Grant between Burghers and Loyalists, Method of Distribution, etc., *Nov. 5*, 137, 138 ; *Nov. 6*, 340, 341, 342, 343.

Ritualistic Practices

St. John's Church Day School, Sutton-on Plym—Case of Alice Keates.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1236.

Roads

Limerick Road Labour Scheme, Expediting Working of.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1113.

Ross-shire.

Applecross, Road Construction in—Refusal of Congested Districts Board to provide Grant-in-Aid.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 749.

Construction of Roads in Mid-Ross, Insufficiency of Congested Districts Board Grant.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 748.

Roberts, Mr. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]

Africa, South — Compensation for War Losses, Extent of Compensation due according to the Hague Convention —Effect of Annexation of Republics, Question of acknowledging Boer Requisition Notes, *Nov. 5*, 248.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 6*, 358 ; *Nov. 12*, 772.

Roberts, Mr. H. [Denbighshire, W.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 13*, 959.

School Buildings — Denominational Schools leased to School Boards, Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as a Denominational School, *Nov. 5*, 149.

Welsh Intermediate Education—County Councils' Powers etc., *Nov. 19*, 1361.

Indian Expenditure Commission Recommendations, Cost of the India Office, Parliamentary Facilities for Discussion of Indian Affairs, etc., *Nov. 10*, 501.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]

Army Reservists—Number of Unemployed Reservists referred to in Letter of Lord Roberts and Mr Brodrick, *Nov. 17*, 1117.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No.2) Bill, 2R, *Nov. 10*, 575.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 117, 118 ; *Nov. 7*, 420 ; *Nov. 12*, 785 ; *Nov. 14*, 1062, 1065, 1067 ; *Nov. 17*, 1196, 1197, 1200, 1202, 1214, 1215, 1218.

Indian Budget Debate taking precedence of the Appropriation Bill, *Nov. 10*, 469, 470.

School Buildings — Regulations for Denominational Schools transferred to School Boards to which Building Grants have been made, *Nov. 4*, 9, 10.

Supply Procedure — Re-opening Supply after it had been closed for the Session, Question whether Motion for going into Supply should be put from the Chair, *Nov. 5*, 210.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony Grant-in-Aid — Amount already expended, Allocation of Grant, etc., *Nov. 6*, 339, 341, 342.

Robertson, Mr. H. [Hackney]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 17*, 1214, 1215.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 335, 336, 368.

Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1133, 1138.

Rock Angus

Lighting proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1127.

Rolleston, Sir J. F. L. [Leicester]

India—Closing of Mints in Native States, *Nov. 7*, 383.

Rolls, Ex-Constable

Conviction of Perjury — Dismissal of Second Constable from the Force.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 7.

Roscommon

County and District Council Elections, Re-elected Councillors acting as paid Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks at contested Elections.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1124.

Roscrea

Justices of the Peace, Additional Appointments, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 878.

Labourers' Cottages, Applications for—Selection of Sites by the District Council.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 751.

Rosebery, Earl of

Healy's, Mr. T. M., Criticism of, *Nov. 11*, 689.

Ross-shire

Applecross—Construction of Road and Bridge—Congested Districts Board refusing Grant-in-Aid.
Q. Nov. 12, 749.

Roads in Mid-Ross, Construction of—Insufficiency of Congested Districts Board Grant.
Q. Nov. 12, 748.

Roumania

Jews, Treatment of — American Note, Date of Publication of Correspondence.
Q. Nov. 18, 1231.

Rumbold, Sir H.

Publication of Reminiscences—British Government Sanction for Publication of Private Conversations, etc.
Q. Nov. 13, 871.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]

Education (England and Wales) Bill' *com.*, *Nov. 13*, 934, 947, 959.

Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 725, 728.

Russia

Afghanistan and Russia—Direct Communication from the Russian Government to the Amir, etc., alleged.
Q. Nov. 13, 868.

Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 449.

Sadler, Col. S. A. [Middlesborough]

Fenwick's, Mr., Explorations and Discoveries in British Honduras—Report to the Colonial Office, *Nov. 19*, 1352.

St. Helena

Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 10*, 449.

St. John's Church, Sutton-on-Plym

Day Schools—Ritualistic Practices, Case of Alice Keates.
Q. Nov. 18, 1236.

St. Mary's National School, Drogheda

Head Teacher losing £50 a year owing to Commissioners' interpretation of New Rules.
Qs. Nov. 5, 147; *Nov. 13*, 879.

Salisbury

Post Office—Appointment of Son of the Postmaster as Telegraphist, Objections.
Q. Nov. 6, 260.

Salop, County of

Technical Instruction—Minute sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act of 1889, Presented. *Nov. 19*, 1345.

Samuel, Mr. H. S. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse].

Africa, East—British Protectorates, Conditions of Land Grants, *Nov. 13*, 871.

Samuel, Mr. H. S.—*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Denominational Schools leased to School Boards, Status of, etc., *Nov. 13*, 876.

Samoa

Settlement of Claims by Arbitration; Decision of the King of Sweden and Norway—Convention Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1105; *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Sandhurst Military College

Letters to Cadets, Safe distribution of—Arrangements for Cashing Crossed Cheques, etc.
Q. Nov. 10, 457.

Sassoon, Sir E. [Hythe]

India—Application of Gold Remittances, Currency Reserves, Number of Rupees Coined, etc.
Q. Nov. 6, 262.

Savings Banks

Post Office—Total Amount of Interest Credited in 1899, Amount credited to Accounts having a balance over £50.
Q. Nov. 19, 1347.

Scannell, Mr. J.

Sunday Trading Prosecution at Dartmouth.
Q. Nov. 17, 1121.

Scinde, Punjab and Delhi Railway

Deposit at Bank of England belonging to Shareholders, Treasury acquiring control.
Q. Nov. 5, 134.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]

India.

Expenditure, Cost of Entertaining Indian Coronation Guests, Coronation Durbar, Inquiry into Taxation proposed, etc., *Nov. 10*, 572.

Home Charges, etc.—Amount drawn from India during present Financial Year, *Nov. 5*, 134.

Telegraph Service—Commencing Wages of Learners, Extending special rate of Pay, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1347.

Scotland

Secretary—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Under Secretary—Sir C. Scott Moncrieff.

Lord Advocate — Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Solicitor General—Mr. C. Scott Dickson.

Aird (Stornoway) School Playground—Provision of Shelter for use in severe weather proposed.
Q. Nov. 18, 1234.

Scotland—*cont.*

Applecross — Construction of Road and Bridge, Refusal of the Congested Districts Board to provide Grant-in-Aid.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 749.

Ben Wyvis, Converting Grazings on Southern Slopes into Deer Forest—Securing Grazings for Crofters' Holdings proposed.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 142.

Clyde, Port Local Authority—Glasgow Corporation Application, Laying Report upon the Table.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1123.

Congested Districts, Population, Valuation, etc.—Granting Return.
Q. *Nov 4*, 11.

Congested Districts Board, for collective heading *see* Congested Districts Board.

Crown Property—Income Tax Arrears, Steps taken to recover.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1036.

Deer Forests, for collective heading *see* Deer Forests.

Fisheries, for collective heading *see* Fisheries.

Glasgow, *see* that title.

Glastullich Farm, Adding to Rhidorroch Deer Forest.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 10.

Larbert Railway Accident—Board of Trade Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 872.

Lewis, Island of, *see* that title.

Ness.

Harbour of Port Ness, Condition of—Report, Selection of Engineer.
Qs. *Nov. 17*, 1107; *Nov. 19*, 1348.

Insanitary Condition of Houses, Death of Mackay from Typhus.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 750.

Parliamentary Register, Number of Persons removed from Register for non-payment of Rates—Return.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1107.

Piers and Harbours, Grants-in-Aid—Names of places for which grants were refused.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1347.

Port Ellen—Mail Delays.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 858.

Post Office, for collective heading, *see* Post Office.

Roads, for collective heading, *see* Roads.

Ross-shire, *see* that title.

Stornoway, *see* that title.

Tolsta School, Number of Pupils—Cause of temporary Closing of School, etc.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 874.

Trawling, *see* that title.

Seamen

Mercantile Marine—Number, Ages, Ratings and Nationalities of Seamen employed—Return presented, *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Naval Seamen.

Cost of Training.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1228.

Pensioners Re-engaged—Modification of terms proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 742.

Seccombe, Sir Thomas

Services as Financial Adviser to the Secretary of State for India.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 473

Secondary and Technical Education

Committees—Number and Composition of Technical Committees in Counties and County Boroughs established under Technical Instruction Act—Return Presented, *Nov. 11*, 585.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.

Minute sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act of 1898 Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1345.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]

Militia and Yeomanry Bill, 2R., *Nov. 10*, 583.

Shackleton, Mr. W. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 7*, 403; *Nov. 12*, 840.

Shannon River

Construction of Bridge at Hatley—Terms of Loan from Public Works Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 466.

Shipbuilding Yards

Londonderry — Inspection by the Admiralty, Placing on Admiralty List, etc.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 758.

Shipping

See Mercantile Marine.

Silverbridge

Revolver fired at Tullyvallen National Band—Prosecution.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]

Commerce, Minister of — Appointment proposed, *Nov. 13*, 882.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 13*, 901, 902, 905, 906; *Nov. 17*, 1163, 1164.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Position of Cann Hall District, *Nov. 18*, 1230.

Sittings of the House

All-Night Sittings, Merits and Demerits of, as a method of expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 614.

Autumn Sittings, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Sittings of the House—*cont.*
Extension of a Session to an indefinite period, Merits and Demerits of, as a means of expediting Parliamentary Business.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Nov. 11*, 615.

Skewes-Cox, Mr. T. [Surrey, Kingston]
Civil Service Abstractor Clerks—Extension of System of Personal Allowances or Gratuities proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1349.

Slavery
Zanzibar, Case of Slave Girl Msichoke—British Agent's Report.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 586.

Sligo
Canadian Mail Service with Great Britain—Sligo as a Port of Call proposed.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753,

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Army, Gratuities on Transfer to Reserve or Discharge, Refusal of Applications, *Nov. 14*, 1034.
Ireland.
Belfast.
Infirmary—Death of Child, Medical Officer refusing to grant Death Certificate, *Nov. 10*, 463.
Lindsay, H. — Prosecution for assault, *Nov. 17*, 1125, 1126.
Police Barracks, Number of, *Nov. 13*, 879.
Postmen's Maximum Wages, Rate of, compared with Dublin Postmen, *Nov. 10*, 462.
Winter Assizes—Establishment of Court for trying Civil Cases and Appeals, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1124.
Dublin Custom House, Nuns begging alms, *Nov. 4*, 13.
Macauley's, Mr. J., Disloyal Speech at Belfast—Government Action, *Nov. 13*, 880, 881.
Malicious Injuries, Compensation for—Case of Mr. R. Sproule, *Nov. 6*, 274.
Monaghan — Number of Constables doing Town Duty, Religious Denominations, etc., *Nov. 4*, 13.
Roscommon, County and District Council Elections — Re-elected Councillors acting as paid Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks at contested Elections, *Nov. 17*, 1124.
Tyson's, District Inspector, Speech denouncing Freemasonry, *Nov. 4*, 14.

Small Dwellings Acquisition Act
Number of Applications for Loans, Loan sanctioned, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 140 ; *Nov. 12*, 743.

Smith, Mr. Parker [Lanark, Partick]
Clyde, Port Local Authority—Glasgow Corporation Application, Laying Report upon the Table, *Nov. 17*, 1123.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 644.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]
London Water Bill—Date of resuming Debate, *Nov. 11*, 588.

Sneem
Licensing Case—Police opposing Licence of Mary Doyle, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Soames, Mr. A. W. [Norfolk, S.]
Charing Cross to the Mall, New Street—Date of beginning work, *Nov. 17*, 1122

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]
Education (England and Wales) Bill ,*com.* *Nov. 12*, 814, 815, 818, 833, 837 ; *Nov. 17*, 1215, 1217 ; *Nov. 18*, 1267, 1274, 1295.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Denominational Schools leased to School Boards, Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as Denominational School, *Nov. 5*, 149.

Soldiers
Employment of ex-Soldiers.
Clerical Department of the War Office Principle of Appointments.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 744.
War Office Measures.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 138.
Gratuities on transfer to Reserve or Discharge—Refusal of Applications.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1034.
Reservists.
Civilian Duties—Garrison Artillery Experiment.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 269.
Number of Unemployed Reservists referred to in Letter of Lord Roberts and Mr. Brodrick.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1117.
See also Army—Reservists.
Time-expired Men—Age Limit for Re-enlistment.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 269.

Somaliland Campaign
Troops conveyed to Berbera in subsidised German Steamer " Bundesrath."
Qs. *Nov. 10*, 457, 458.

South African Shipping Trade
Conference Lines—Notification of Increase in rate of Freight to Traders, Dissatisfaction among Traders—Powers of the Board of Trade to intervene.
Qs. *Nov. 10*, 459, 460.

South African War
British Officers' Fraudulent Attempts to obtain evidence of malpractices against Members of the Cape Parliament—Date of Presenting Report.
Q. *Nov. 14,* 1036.

Cost and Finance of the War—Terminal Charges, Revised Estimate Presented, *Nov. 6,* 258 ; *Nov. 10,* 450.

Honours for War Office Officials.
Q. *Nov. 17,* 1117.

Medals.

Dates of Service, Effect of Regulations on Auxiliary Forces and Colonial Troops.
Qs. *Nov. 17,* 1118; *Nov. 19,* 1353.

Transport Officers, Medals for—Exclusion of Masters of Mail Steamers.
Q. *Nov. 17,* 1105.

Yeomanry Battalions sent to South Africa in 1902, Granting Medal proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19,* 1354.

Pillage by British Troops.
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *Nov. 5,* 249.

Requisition Notes issued by War Office, Payment of.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov.5,*247.

Transport Service—Medals for Transport Officers.
Q. *Nov. 17,* 1105.

South Eastern and Chatham Railway
Hours of Railway Servants—Case of Guard at Hither Green Station.
Q. *Nov. 12,* 747.

South Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Nov. 18,* 1225.

South Norfolk Light Railways
Amendment Order Presented, *Nov. 10,* 451 ; *Nov. 17,* 1097.

Southwark
Denominational Schools, Re building—Application of Money from City Parochial Charities Fund.
Q. *Nov. 13,* 874.

Spanton, Mr. J. P.
Army Veterinary Captain—Qualification for Appointment.
Q. *Nov. 14,* 1036.

Speaker of the House, 1841
Appropriation was always reserved for the end of the Session, and it was irregular to introduce any clause of Appropriation into a Revenue or other Bill passing through Parliament at an earlier period, *Nov. 4,* 89.

Speaker—Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully [Carlisle]
Adjournment of the Debate, Motion for, Going into details of a Bill on—The ground for moving the Adjournment was that the Bill had not been explained. Therefore the Minister might be permitted briefly to show that he had already explained the Bill, *Nov. 10,* 580.

Adjournment of the House, Motion for, under Standing Order xvii—Tunbridge Wells Telephone System, Motion could not be accepted, There appeared to be a dispute between the Town Council and the Town Clerk, and it was not a matter of Public Administration at all, *Nov. 11,* 603.

Amendments to a Resolution on Business of the House (Closure by Compartments)—Following the Precedents of the Crimes Act, the Home Rule Bill, and the Evicted Tenants Act, the first Amendment would be put in such a way as to reserve the other Amendments, *Nov. 11,* 604.

Bills—Discussing the Merits of a Clause and the Amendments proposed to it on a Motion for closure of proceedings in Committee, *Nov. 11,* 638.

Chair, Conduct of—It was not allowable to discuss beforehand and even to dictate to the Chair what its course should be, *Nov. 11,* 632.

Interruption in Debate—The Member had said nothing out of order, *Nov. 11,* 709.

Irrelevant Observations, *Nov. 11,* 671, 689.

Procedure Rules, Criticism of, in debate on the Education Bill, *Nov. 11,* 635.

The Question put from the Chair had limited the Discussion since the Member had spoken to the Main Question, *Nov. 10,* 515.

Money Resolution—Irregular discussion, *Nov. 17,* 1132.

Order—It was not a Question of Order but of Arrangement, *Nov. 10,* 574.

Personalties —Personal Assault on one Member by another, alleged — The Member was merely drawing his own conclusions from what he saw, *Nov. 11,* 634.

Questions.

Arguing on the Merits of an Amendment to a Bill, *Nov. 14,* 1038.

Arguing whether or not the Answer is satisfactory, *Nov. 11,* 749.

Argumentative Statements were not admitted on a Question, *Nov. 17,* 1130.

Comment on the Answer was not admissible, *Nov. 14,* 1037.

Second Reading Speech could not be made on a Motion for Application of Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11,* 671.

cont.

Speaker—*cont.*
Speaking twice on Second Reading of a Bill. If the Member only wanted information the House would probably allow him to continue his Speech after receiving it, *Nov. 5*, 255.
Supply.
Irrelevant Observations— Discussing Form of Government, Compensation to Loyalists for War Losses, etc., on the Vote for Grant-in-Aid to the Transvaal, *Nov. 6*, 345, 346.
Notes issued by the late Transvaal Government, Payment of—It did not appear that the Question as to the liability of the Government for these Notes arose on the Vote for the Grant-in-Aid to the Transvaal—If the Colonial Secretary said that the Government proposed to pay these Notes out of this Vote then the discussion was in Order, *Nov. 6*, 346, 347.
Procedure—Standing Order 56, Procedure on setting up Supply for Additional Estimates during Autumn Sitting—The occasion was exceptional and it could not be regarded as going into Committee of Supply for the first time in the sense contemplated by the Standing Order—The Speaker could not twice in the same Session leave the Chair for the first time, *Nov. 5*, 210, 211.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon, Tavistock]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 5*, 169; *Nov. 7*, 390; *Nov. 19*, 1429.

Spen Valley and Morley Light Railways
Order Presented, *Nov. 10*, 452; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Sproule, Mr. R.
Malicious Injuries to Mare, Compensation Claim—Action of the Government.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 274.

Stanley, Lord—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Lancashire, West Houghton]
Canteens—Continuance of Tenant System, *Nov. 18*, 1240, 1241.
Clothing Contracts—Provision in Tenders for work to be carried out in Factories, *Nov. 18*, 1240.
Commissions—Militia Officers enlisting in the Army to serve in South Africa, Granting Commissions to, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1240.
Entrance Examinations—Uncertainty as to Syllabus, Inconvenience caused to Public Schools, *Nov. 19*, 1355.
Horses—South Africa, Sale of Army Horses suffering from Infectious Disease, alleged, *Nov. 11*, 590

Stanley, Lord—*cont.*
Mobilisation — Government's Alleged Intention to keep Force mobilised and ready for embarkation, *Nov. 11*, 593.
Reservists.
Pay Arrears, *Nov. 11*, 592.
Rejoining the Army — Conditions, *Nov. 19*, 1354-5.
South African War Medals.
Auxiliary Forces, Effect of Regulations on, *Nov. 19*, 1354.
Yeomanry Battalions sent to South Africa in 1902, Granting Medals to, *Nov. 19*, 1354.
Staff Appointments, Tenure reduced from five years to three, *Nov. 11*, 592.
Transvaal—Repatriation of Boers, Grant. Prices paid for Horses, Open, etc. *Nov. 11*, 591.
Volunteers—South African War, Treatment of Volunteer Officers as to Pay-Leave and Decorations, *Nov. 19*, 1353.

Starkie, Dr.
Statements against Irish Primary School Managers—Roman Catholic Managers' Resolutions, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 147; *Nov. 12*, 752.

Stationery Office
Use of Foreign-made Pencils—Orders to Home Manufacturers, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 143.

Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom
Delay in Distribution of.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1359.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 6*, 286; *Nov. 17*, 1208; *Nov. 18*, 1243.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Committees, Spending Powers of, *Nov. 5*, 143.
Macedonia — Reforms, Attitude of the Powers—Bulgarian Prime Minister's Statement, *Nov. 6*, 271.

Stewart, Sir M. [Kirkcudbright]
Butterine Bill—Re-introduction of, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 461.

Stornoway
Aird School Playground—Provision for Shelter for use in severe weather.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1234.
Mail Service—Names and Ages of Steamers employed, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 5*, 141; *Nov. 18*, 1235.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
Butterine Bill—Re-introduction of, under title of Adulterated Butter Bill, proposed *Nov. 10*, 461.

cont.

Strachey, Sir E.—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 165; *Nov. 6*, 301; *Nov. 7*, 386; *Nov. 12*, 803, 805; *Nov. 14*, 1071; *Nov. 17*, 1172, 1187, 1190; *Nov. 19*, 1445, 1446, 1448.
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 721, 725.
Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1141.
Volunteers, Camp Attendance—Optional attendance of Long Service Men, *Nov. 13*, 864.

Strangford Lough.
Lighting Rock Angus, proposed.
O. Nov. 17, 1127.

Street Traffic in London
Means of Locomotion and Transportation—Royal Commission, proposed.
Qs. Nov. 11, 601; *Nov. 12*, 759; *Nov. 17*, 1116.

Strokestown
Union Amalgamation, Resolution.
Q. Nov. 13, 880.

Sugar Bounties
Brussels Convention.
Communications from the Belgian Government—Extension of time for ratification, etc.
Q. Nov. 6, 270.
Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Nov. 11, 600.
Sanction by Parliament—Adequate time for discussion of Resolution.
Q. Nov. 10, 468.
Canadian Bounty on Beet Sugar, Rate of—Imports on to the United Kingdom, etc.
Q. Nov. 6, 271.
Indian Countervailing Duties, Effect of Imposition.
Q. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 10*, 574.

Sullivan, Mr. D. (Westmeath, S.)
Ireland.
Athlone Police Barracks, Outbreak of Fever—Refusal of Inspector-General to pay cost of Medical treatment at Fever Hospital, *Nov. 10*, 455.
Local Government Board Inspectors and Auditors, Return as to—Claims of Union Officials to Vacancies, etc., *Nov. 10*, 454.

Sunday Trading
Dartmouth, Prosecution of Mr. J. Scannell.
Q. Nov. 17, 1121.

Superannuation
See titles Civil Service and Poor Law Officers.

Supply
Civil Service (1902-3) Additional Estimate Transvaal and Orange River Colony (£8,000,000) *com. Nov. 5*, 211; *Report, Nov. 6*, 338.
Indian Vote, Placing on the Estimates, proposed.
References to, in Debate on Indian Financial Statement, Nov. 10, 505, 511, 518.
Party Considerations, Danger of importing into Discussion of Indian Affairs.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 518.
Procedure.
New Rule, Advantage of Permission to arrange Time and Order of Votes.
O. Mr. P. Smith, *Nov. 11*, 645.
Re-opening Committee of Supply after the Passage of the Appropriation Bill on a Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, *Nov. 4*, 79.
Appropriation Act the Sole Guarantee of Parliamentary Control over National Finances, 87, 94.
Autumn Sittings, Business which may properly be taken—Precedents of the past 100 years, etc., 91, 92, 106, 107.
Balfour, Mr. A. J., Absence from the House during Discussion, 92, 96.
Demand of the Crown for Supply—Significance of Formalities prescribed, Respect owed by the Sovereign to the House, 84, 85.
Exceptional Circumstances justifying Exceptional Procedure, 83, 110, 114—Contradiction, 98.
Methods of Procedure proper to be followed in emergencies necessitating new Expenditure, 90, 93, 103, 108, 109.
Precedents of 1721 and 1748, 94.
New Precedent, Dangers of creating, 94, 97, 103.
Right Method of Supply, Standing Order 54—Principle of Grievance before Supply, 86, 94.
Sessional Order on Supply passed on April 28, Contravention of, 85, 86, 104.
Standing Order 56—Autumn Sitting, Putting the Motion for going into Supply from the Chair—The occasion was exceptional and it was not going into Committee of Supply for the first time in the sense contemplated by the Standing Order. The Speaker could not twice in the same Session leave the Chair for the first time, *Nov. 5*, 210, 211.

cont.

Supply—*cont.*
Procedure—*cont.*
Supplementary Estimates—Evils of.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Nov. 4*, 90.
Time wasted in Discussion of—Consequent Abandonment of Abstract Motions, which formerly obtained on Tuesday and Friday.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 517.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill
c. 2R., *Nov. 5*, 252.
com. and Report*, *Nov. 6*, 380.
*con.** *Nov. 7*, 448.
3R.* *Nov. 14*, 1095.

Sutton-on-Plym
St. John's Church Day Schools—Ritualistic Practices, Case of Alice Keates.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1236.

Swilly, Lough
Port Erlin Boat Slip—Arrangements for Construction of.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 759.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 310, 313.

Tallow
Conspiracy Case, O'Keeffe *v.* Walsh—Charge of Lord Chief Baron, Breach of Public Trust by Officials, alleged.
Qs. *Nov. 17*, 1128; *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Tara, Hill of
Excavations—Steps taken to preserve Historical Monuments from destruction.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 463.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, East Toxteth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 19*, 1415.

Teachers
see titles Education, and Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Technical Education
see title Secondary and Technical Education.

Telegraph Service
Betting Telegrams.
Clerks in receipt of 12s. to 30s. per week, Preventing Employment in transmission of Sporting Telegrams.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 132.
Money Orders containing Instructions as to Bets, Preventing use of Telegraph Service for Gambling Transactions.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 131.
Cable Communication, *see* that title.

Telegraph Service—*cont.*
Employees.
Age Retirement, Enforcing.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 870.
Male Clerks placed under control of Women Supervisors — Abolition of Practice, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1109.
Salaries.
Commencing Wages of Learners —Extending special rate of pay, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1347.
Salary of £190 a year, Qualifications.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 859.
Pencils—Supply of British-made instead of Foreign-made, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 461.
Re-direction of Telegrams free of charge by post proposed.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 869.

Telephone Service
Ireland—Towns connected by Trunk Telephone System, Guarantees, etc.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1109.
Post Office System—Amount expended, Number of Subscribers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1359.
Tunbridge Wells Municipal Telephone System, Purchase by National Telephone Co.—Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 602.
Motion for Adjournment, proposed (Mr. Lough), *Nov. 11*, 603.

"Terrible," H.M.S.
Boiler Repairs—Laying List upon the Table.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1119.
Crew of—Arrangements for Christmas Leave.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1228.

Thames Ironworks Level Crossing
Fatal Accident to Henry Eade.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 747.

Thomas, Mr. Abel [Carmarthen, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 5*, 188.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Army — Mountain Artillery, Officers receiving lower pay than Officers of Garrison Artillery, *Nov. 13*, 865.
Navy.
Coal.
New Zealand Coal, Sort supplied to the China Squadron, *Nov. 13*, 867; *Nov. 17*, 1105; *Nov. 18*, 1238, 1239.
Welsh and New Zealand Coal —Comparisons in relation of bulk to weight, Effectiveness in development of Steam, Price, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1355.
"Cressy," H.M.S.—Result of Speed Trials, *Nov. 19*, 1356.

Thomas, Mr. F. Freeman [Hastings]
Poor Law Officers Superannuation—Establishment of Central Fund, Enforcing Retirement Regulations, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1349.

Thomas, Sir Alfred [Glamorgan, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 12*, 765.

Thomastown
Fleming, District Inspector, Action of—Guardians' Complaints.
Q. Nov. 19, 1363.

Thompson, Dr. E. C. [Monaghan, N.]
Army Recruits — System of sending Recruits to outlying Barracks — Increasing Accommodation of Omagh Barracks, etc., *Nov. 6*, 268.
Ireland.
Consumption, Spread of—Provision of Sanatoria, *Nov. 13*, 866.
Dublin Four Courts, Delay in Cases pending Trial, *Nov. 13*, 862.
Emyval, Dispensary Medical Officer, Reduction of Salary, *Nov. 13*, 867.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Organising Teachers, Status of, *Nov. 5*. 134.

Tolsta School
Number of Pupils, Cause of temporary closing of School, etc.
Q. Nov. 13, 874.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 672.

Tomlinson, Sir W. E. M. [Preston]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 18*, 1247 ; *Nov. 19*, 1435.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Lancashire, Bury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments. *Nov. 11*, 704.

Trade, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. A. Bonar Law.
Labour Department—Trade Unions, Report with Comparative Statistics Presented, *Nov. 4*, 3 ; *Nov. 17*, 1097.
Reform proposed.
Q. Nov. 13, 882.

Trade Marks
Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents Rule Presented, *Nov. 5*, 129 ; *Nov. 17*, 1095.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130 ; *Nov. 10*, 449 ; *Nov. 14*, 1034 ; *Nov. 17*, 1105, *Nov. 18*, 1225.
Miscellaneous Series Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130 ; *Nov. 10*, 449.

Trade Unions
Report of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade with Comparative Statistics Presented, *Nov. 4*, 3 ; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Trade and Commerce
Colonial Trading Companies, Parliamentary and Municipal Representation—Circular Despatch Presented, *Nov. 5*, 130 ; *Nov. 10*, 449.

Compendium of Trade within the Empire Publication of annually, proposed.
Q. Nov. 6, 259.
Foreign Competition—Education (England and Wales) Bill, Protest against Restriction of Debate.
O. Mr. Broadhurst, *Nov. 11*, 670.
Minister of Commerce, Appointment proposed.
Q. Nov. 13, 882.
Municipal Trading—Royal Commission, Appointment proposed.
Q. Nov. 17, 1129.
Preferential Tariff for Empire Products—Newfoundland Treaty with United States binding Colony not to accept Preferential Tariff, alleged.
Q. Nov. 13, 865.

Tramways (Ireland) Act
Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Surplus Profit — Enforcing Section 5 of the Act.
Q. Nov. 13, 873.
Report of Public Works Commissioners, Publication of Amendment of Act, proposed.
Q. Nov. 11, 598.

Transport Service
South African War.
"Britannic"—Number of Troops embarked from South Africa on 7th July, for Australia, Number of Deaths.
Q. Nov. 17, 1116.
Medals for Transport Officers.
Q. Nov. 17, 1105.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony
Administration.
Cost of.
O. Mr. Labouchere, *Nov. 5*, 225.
Form of Government at present existing, Question as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Nov. 6*, 339, Mr. Labouchere, 344.
Annexation by Great Britain—Effect on Situation as regards Compensation for War Losses.
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *Nov. 5*, 250.
British Indian Subjects, Disabilities of—Retaliatory Legislation by Indian Administration, proposed.
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *Nov. 10*, 554, 555.

cont.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—*cont.*

Government Loans to Boers—Loans in Cash and in Kind, Prices of Oxen and Mules, Veterinary Examination, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 4*, 6; *Nov. 6*, 265.

Grant-in-Aid—Repatriation, Compensation for War Losses, etc.

American Civil War Precedent—New Precedent created by Grant-in-Aid.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 240.

Boers, Grant to.

Allocation of Grant.

Classes of Persons to whom help will be given.
Os. Mr. Chamberlain, *Nov 5*, 238.

Requisition Notes issued during the War, Question of acknowledging.
Observations in Committee of Supply, *Nov. 5*, 238, 243, 247, 248; *Report of Supply*, *Nov. 6*, 346, 347; *Nov. 10*, 576.

Amount already expended—Purchase of Diseased Animals from the Military, Prices paid to the Military for Animals, etc.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Nov. 5*, 226; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 230; Mr. E. Robertson, *Nov. 6*, 338; Mr. Labouchere, 576.
Qs. *Nov. 5*. 137; *Nov. 11*, 591.

Conference between Colonial Secretary and Boer Generals proposed.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1352.

Methods of Distribution, Waste of Money, Pauperisation of Boers, etc.
O. Mr. A. Davies, *Nov. 19*, 1468.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 138.

Source from which the Grant should be supplied.

Government misleading the House as to its Obligations under Peace Terms.
Observations on Motion to set up Committee of Supply, *Nov. 4*, 98, 99, 100, 101; *Committee of Supply*, 217, 233, 234.

Interpretation of Peace Terms—Difference between the views of Government and the Boer Leaders as to Source from which the Grant should be given.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—*cont.*

Grant-in-Aid—*cont.*

Boers, Grant to—*cont.*

Observations on Motion to set up Committee of Supply, *Nov. 4*, 81, 85, 98, 102, 113; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 234, 235.

Transvaal Loan—Portion of Grant to be repaid from the Loan, Reasons for not charging entire Grant upon the Loan and for postponing the floating of the Loan.
Observations on Motion to set up Committee of Supply, *Nov. 4*, 81, 82, 83, 100, 102, 105, 110, 111, 113; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 235.

Compensation for War Losses—Amount due under The Hague Convention.
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *Nov. 5*, 249.

Generosity of Government Grant and Loan to the Boers.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *Nov. 5*, 226.; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 238.

Inadequacy of Grant.
Observations in Committee of Supply, *Nov. 5*, 220, 223, 251.

Loan on Special Terms by H.M. Government.—Allocation of between Burghers and Loyalists
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, *Nov. 6*, 339; Mr. Lough, 340, Mr. Ritchie, 340, 341.

Principle of Distribution.
Q. *Nov. 7*, 386.

Transvaal Loan, Repayment from—Discrepancy between Words of Peace Terms and Words of Vote in Supply.
O. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 5* 221.

Wisdom of introducing Loan System among Boers, Question as to.
O. Mr. Lambert, *Nov. 5*, 229.

Loyalists, Grant to.

Allocation of Grant.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *Nov. 5*, 226; Mr. Labouchere, *Nov. 6*, 344; Mr. Channing, 347.

Principles to be observed in Allocation, etc.
O. Mr. Ritchie, *Nov. 6*, 343.

[*cont.*

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—*cont.*
Grant-in-Aid—*cont.*
Cape Colony and Natal Loyalists, Question as to inclusion among the "other persons" of the Vote, etc.
O. Mr. Labouchere, *Nov. 5*, 224.
Scale of Compensation to be granted to Loyalists as compared with that given to Burghers.
Os. Mr. Ritchie. *Nov. 4*, 82; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 240; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 246.
Motion to set up Committee of Supply (Mr. Ritchie) *Nov. 4*, 79.
Procedure—Exceptional character of Motion, etc. *See* Supply—Procedure.
Vote for, *Nov. 5*, 211; *Nov. 6*, 338.
Irrigation—Large Scheme of Irrigation and Colonisation, the Key to the South African Problem.
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *Nov. 5*, 214.
Johannesburg Local Rates, Raising—Consent of the Governor of the Transvaal.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 266.
Labour—Plentiful supply of Labour, the one thing needful for Prosperity, etc.
O. Sir H. Meysey-Thompson, *Nov. 5*, 222.
Land—Increase in value since the War.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 237.
Liquor Ordinance, Publication of.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 136.
Loan.
Amount of Loan.
O. Mr. Labouchere, *Nov. 5*, 224.
Grant in Aid of Transvaal and Orange River Colony—Portion to be charged on the Loan, Reasons for not charging entire Grant on the Loan and for postponing the floating of the Loan.
Observations in Debate on Motion to set up Committee of Supply, Nov. 4, 81, 82, 88, 100, 102, 105, 110, 111, 113.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 235.
Difference between words of Peace Terms and words of Vote in Supply.
O. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 5*, 221.
Method by which the Funds are to be raised in the Colonies, Security, etc.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Nov. 6*, 339; Mr. Ritchie, 342, 348; Mr. Labouchere, 345.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—*cont.*
Repatriation—Extent to which Repatriation has already taken place.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 5*, 233, 241.
Repatriation Board—Delays caused by Military Authorities, etc.
O. Mr. Lambert, *Nov. 5*, 228.

Trawling
Dublin Bay, Illegal Fishing in—Injury done to line fishermen.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 753.
Scotland.
Lewis, Island of—Provision of Gunboat to protect line fishermen against trawlers.
Os. *Nov. 11*, 595; *Nov. 12*, 750.
Protection against illegal trawling, Additional Cruisers.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 11.

Treaties with Foreign Powers
Reciprocal Agreements with regard to China and Japan.
Q. *Nov. 19*, 1350.

Treaty Series
Papers Presented, *Nov. 13*, 857.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 6*, 321; *Nov. 13*, 912, 913, 921, 933; *Nov. 17*, 1171; *Nov. 18*, 1302; *Nov. 19*, 1367, 1400.
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 648, 726, 727.
Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1140.
Religious Instruction — Managers' Decisions subjected to appeal to Episcopal Authority where Trust Deed provides for it, *Nov. 19*, 1365.
Johannesburg Local Rates, Raising—Consent of the Governor of the Transvaal, *Nov. 6*, 266.

Tuesday Sittings of the House
Abstract Motions abandoned owing to elaborate Discussion of Supply.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 516.

Tufnell, Lieut. Col. E. [Essex, S.E.]
Army Officers—Position, Pay and Allowances, Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 268.
Islington Parish Church Bells, Ringing on King's Birthday—Auditor disallowing Cost, *Nov. 17*, 1122.

Tuke, Sir J. B. (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities).
Hong Kong—Garrison Officers, Increase in Lodging and Servant Allowances, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1115.

Tully, Mr. J. (Leitrim, S.)
- Army.
  - Canteens—Tenant System, Continuance of, *Nov. 18,* 1240, 1241.
  - Staff Appointments, Tenure reduced from five years to three, *Nov.* 11, 592.
- Bankers (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill, 2R; *Nov. 5,* 255.
- Explosives, Pembroke Urban Council Byelaw, Objections to—Local Government Board Sanction, *Nov. 10,* 466.
- Ireland.
  - Ballaghaderreen—Refusal of Transfer of Publican's Licence to Mr. J. Casey, *Nov. 6,* 274.
  - Belfast.
    - Borough Accounts — Non-publication of Auditor's Report, *Nov. 5,* 146, 147.
    - Lindsay, H., Prosecution of, for Assault, *Nov. 17,* 1126.
    - Re-valuation—Names, Qualifications, etc., of Valuers, *Nov. 19,* 1363.
  - Calderwood, *v.* M'Curdy, Case of, Police Evidence at Quarter Sessions—Proceedings under the Crimes (Ireland) Act, proposed, *Nov. 6,* 276.
  - Canadian Mail Service—Sligo as a Port of Call, proposed, *Nov. 12,* 753.
  - Carrick-on-Shannon disused Prison, Handing over to Leitrim Agricultural and Technical Committee, *Nov. 11,* 599.
  - Constabulary, Royal Irish—J. O'Donnell, Refusal of Admission as Recruit, *Nov. 5,* 145.
  - Coonagh, Col. Finch's Property—Sale to Tenants, *Nov. 4,* 12.
  - Courthouses.
    - Maintenance of — Number of County Councils refusing to vote money, *Nov. 17,* 1128.
    - Use by District Councils—Number of refusals, *Nov, 13,* 879.
  - Crimes Acts.
    - Administration of—Opportunity for Discussion, etc. *Nov. 4,* 14.
    - Ladies, Prosecution of under — Inquiry into Case of Imprisonment, proposed, *Nov. 12,* 754.
  - Deaf and Dumb, Maintenance of, as an Imperial Charge, proposed, *Nov. 4,* 12, 13.
  - Dillon Estate—Advertisement of Mansion for Sale, Private Offers declined, alleged, *Nov. 6,* 276.
  - Drogheda — St. Mary's National School, Head Teacher losing £50 a year owing to New Rules, *Nov. 5,* 147; *Nov. 13,* 879.

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Dublin—Recorder's Court, Accumulation of Cases — Extending Jurisdiction of Court of Conscience, proposed, *Nov. 19,* 1362.
  - "Future Tenants" in County Leitrim, Number created since Land Act of 1881—Safeguarding Interests, Deputation, proposed, *Nov. 10,* 464.
  - Gara Lough Eel Fishery—Proprietor suffering loss owing to Floods caused by Dillon Estate Drainage Operations, *Nov. 11,* 597, 598.
  - Harrell, Sir D., Resignation of Office, Reasons for Acceptance—Government Land Purchase Policy, *Nov. 12,* 753.
  - Henry and others *v* Hamill and Moody—Intervention of the Irish Executive, proposed, *Nov. 13,* 877.
  - Labourers' Acts—Boyle No. 2 District Council—Delay in issue of Supplemental Loan, *Nov.* 5, 145.
  - Land Question, Legislation—Anticipatory Statement, *Nov. 17,* 1129.
  - Limerick, Port of—Injury done to trade of, by Congested Districts Board Subsidy to Clyde Company at Cork, *Nov. 12,* 752.
  - Local Government Report, Want of Index, *Nov. 5,* 148.
  - Londonderry—Post Office Officials, Supervision by Relatives—Case of Londonderry Postmaster's Daughter, *Nov. 19,* 1360.
  - Longford Registry of Titles—Registering Titles a second time under New Rules, etc., *Nov. 17,* 1125.
  - Longford and Leitrim, Number of Fair Rent Applications pending, etc., *Nov. 11,* 599.
  - Lurgan Post Office—Insanitary Condition of temporary Premises, Delay in erection of new Post Office, etc., *Nov. 6,* 273.
  - Medical Officers.
    - County Councillors, Disqualification of Poor Law Medical Officers, *Nov. 13,* 878.
      - Dispensary Medical Service Reform, Need for—Opinion of the President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, *Nov. 6,* 275.
    - Salaries of Medical Officers, Raising, *Nov. 11,* 599, 600.
  - Middleton Guardians granting use of Board Room for Political Meetings —Precedent for Legal Proceedings by the Crown, *Nov 10,* 463.
  - Muldowney, Michael, Imprisonment for complicity in the Craughwell Murder—Date of Release, *Nov. 18,* 1238.

cont.

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Mutoscopes at Longford—Nature of pictures exhibited, Police Supervision, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 752.
    Poor Law Children—Boards refusing permission to Lady Inspector to examine Boarded-out Children, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1127.
    Poor Law Officers' Superannuation, Limitation of Liability of Ratepayers — Legislation proposed, *Nov. 6*, 277.
    Poor Law Unions.
      Amalgamation, Investigations, *Nov. 13*, 880.
      Clerks—Transfer of Work under the Franchise and Jurors Acts to Clerks of Unions, *Nov. 10*, 465.
    Post Office—Number of English and Scottish Officials appointed to Irish Post Offices since 1st January, 1902.
      Nov. 13, 870, 871.
    Priests and Nuns, Re-enacting Penal Laws against, *Nov. 4, 13*.
    Rating Appeals, Number of—Results of Appeals, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
    Shannon River, Construction of Bridge at Hatley—Terms of Loan from Public Works Commissioners, *Nov. 10*, 466.
    Starkie's, Dr., Statements against Primary School Managers — Roman Catholic Managers' Resoutions, *Nov. 5*, 147, 148 ; *Nov. 12* 752.
    Tallow Conspiracy Case—Charge of Lord Chief Baron, Breach of Public Trust by Officials, alleged, *Nov. 17*, 1128 ; *Nov. 19*, 1364.
    Thomastown Guardians' Complaints as to action of District Inspector Fleming, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
    Trawling in Dublin Bay—Destruction caused to line fishermen, *Nov.* 12 753.
  Irish Language.
    Grant paid to Royal Irish Academy for copying Irish Manuscripts and production of Irish Dictionary—Transfer of to the Irish Texts, Society, *Nov. 18*, 1237.
    Inspectors—Appointment of Inspectors capable of examining Pupils in Irish *Nov. 17*, 1129.
    Instruction in—Regulations preventing Department of Agriculture from sanctioning Expenditure *No 13*, 878.
    Letters and Postcards addressed in Irish, Non-delivery of—Appointment of Post Office Officials having knowledge of the Irish Language, proposed, *Nov. 6*, 273 ; *Nov. 10*, 463 ; *Nov. 12*, 757 ; *Nov. 18*, 1237.

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Irish Language—*cont.*
    Magistrates—Appointment of Magistrates having a Knowledge of the Irish Language, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1237.
  Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party—Imprisonment of Members.
    Number in Prison under Hard-Labour Sentences, *Nov. 5*, 146.
    Permission to receive Parliamentary Papers, etc., Modification of Prison Rules, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1364.
  Lewes Guy Fawkes Celebration—Insults to Roman Catholics, alleged, *Nov. 10*, 459.
  Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, Date of proceeding with, *Nov. 11*, 600.
  Sunday Trading, Dartmouth Prosecutions —Enforcing Act against Publicans, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1121, 1122.
  Welsh Language, Rule as to Post Office Officials having a knowledge of—Proportion of English to Welsh-speaking People in any Postal District, *Nov. 10*, 462.

Tullyvallen National Flute Band
  Revolver fired at Band, near Silverbridge —Prosecution.
    Q. *Nov. 13*, 863.

Tunbridge Wells
  Telephone System—Purchase of Municipal System by National Telephone Co., Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk.
    Motion for Adjournment, proposed, (Mr. Lough,) *Nov. 11*, 603.
    Q. *Nov. 11*, 602.

Turkey
  British Postal Orders, Supply of, at British Post Offices—Rates of Commission on Money Orders, etc.
    Q. *Nov. 19*, 1346.
  Macedonian Reforms, Attitude of the Powers—Bulgarian Prime Ministers Statement.
    Q. *Nov. 6*, 271.

Typhus
  Lewis, Island of—Death from Typhus in the Ness District, Insanitary Condition of House, etc.
    Q. *Nov. 12*, 750.

Tyson, District Inspector
  Freemasonry, Alleged Denunciatory Speech.
    Q. *Nov. 4*, 14

Uganda
Land Grants, Conditions.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 871.
Railway.
Contracts with American Firms.
Exclusion of British and Indian Firms.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 743.
Penalties for Delay in fulfilling Contracts.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1111.
Funds, Provision of further funds—Introduction of Bill.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 594.
Rates on Articles taken by Passengers.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1241.

Union of Benefices Act
All Hallows Church, City — Vacancy, Appointment of Commission under the Act.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 5.

United Irish League
Local Authorities, Contracts—Preference given to members of the League, Action of the Government.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 275.

United States of America
Congress, Pressure of Work—Power of the Committee on Rules, Devolution, etc.
Os. Mr. P. Smith, *Nov. 11*, 647; Mr. Lloyd-George, 661.
Mail Service—Discontinuance of accelerated mail train service in connection with mid-week mails *via* Queenstown.
Q. *Nov. 18*, 1234.
Newfoundland Treaty with United States binding Colony not to accept Preferential Tariff for Empire Products, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 13*, 865
Philippine Islands, Maintenance of the Silver Standard — Effect on Indian Commercial Interests in China.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 459.
Samoa Dispute, Settlement of Claims by Arbitration, Decision of the King of Sweden—Convention Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1105; *Nov. 18*, 1225.
Uganda Railway — Contracts given to American Firms.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 743; *Nov. 17*, 1111.
Zanzibar, Import Duties—Convention with the United Kingdom Presented, *Nov. 13*, 857.

Universities, Scotland
Glasgow—Degrees of Science in Public Health, University Court Ordinance Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1227.

University Education, Ireland
Royal Commission, Date of Report.
Q. *Nov. 17*, 1129.

Vaccination
Exemption Certificates—Number granted and number refused.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 139.

Valuation Acts, Ireland
Report of Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, Presented, *Nov. 12*, 761.

Veterinary Department of the Army
Promotion of Mr. J. P. Spanton to rank of Veterinary Captain, Qualifications, etc.
Q. *Nov. 14*, 1036.
Status of Officers who accompanied Remount Officers abroad,
Q. *Nov. 11*, 587.

Village Communities
Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children accommodated, Cost per head per annum, etc.
Q. *Nov. 6*, 261.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]
Army—Average annual Cost of various Arms, *Nov. 7*, 385.
India — Financial Condition, Effect of Currency Changes on Trade, Creation of Reserve Funds, Parliamentary Facilities for Discussion of Indian Affairs, etc., *Nov. 10*, 565.

Vincent, Sir Howard [Sheffield, Central]
Alien Immigration.
Anarchists from Europe settling in London — Legislation proposed *Nov. 19*, 1257.
Number charged at the Metropolitan Police Courts during last year—Expelling Aliens who have made themselves amenable to the Criminal Law, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1357, 1358.
Royal Commission—No meeting held since July, *Nov. 5*, 140, 141.
Army Reservists—Conditions of rejoining the Army, *Nov. 19*, 1354, 1355.
Consular Service Committee.
Distribution of Consular Service—Referring to Committee proposed, *Nov. 10*, 452.
Names of Members, etc., *Nov. 13*, 862.
Factory and Workshops Act, 1901—Objections to New Regulations, Local Enquiry, *Nov. 13*, 862.
Pencils—Provision of English-made pencils in the House of Commons, *Nov. 5*, 144; *Nov. 10*, 461; *Nov. 14*, 1035.
Soldiers, Civil Employment for Discharged Soldiers—War Office Measures, *Nov. 5*, 138.
Transvaal and Orange River Colony Grant in Aid—Allocation of Grant, Generosity of Allowance made to Burghers, *Nov. 5*, 225.

[*cont.*

Vincent, Sir Howard—*cont.*
  Volunteer Officers—Army Rank for Services with the Regular Troops, *Nov. 6*, 264.

Voluntary Schools
  Southwark Schools, Re-building—Application of Money from City Parochial Charities Fund.
    Q. Nov. 13, 874.
  Refer also to Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Volunteers
  Camp Attendance—Optional Attendance of Long Service Men.
    Q. Nov. 13, 864.
  Cost—Average Annual Cost of a Volunteer.
    Q. Nov. 7, 385.
  Establishment Statistics, Number of Regulations, etc.
    Q. Nov. 12, 745.
  Kent Garrison Artillery Volunteers, Second—Armament, Delay in Issue of 6-inch Howitzers.
    Q. Nov. 10, 456.
  Officers.
    Army Rank for Services with the Regular Troops, Question of.
      Q. Nov. 6, 264,
    South African War, *see* that sub-heading.
  Richmond Park — Government setting apart increased areas for Volunteer Drill, etc.
    Q. Nov. 11, 595.
  South African War—Officers.
    Commissions in the Regular Army for Officers commanding Active Service Companies during the South African War, proposed.
      Qs. Nov. 12, 746; *Nov. 19*, 1352
    Decorations, Comparisons between treatment of British and Colonial Officers.
      Q. Nov. 19, 1354.
    Distinction in treatment of Officers who went out at the beginning of the War and those sent out six and eighteen months later, alleged.
      Q. Nov. 19, 1352.
    Number of Officers mentioned in Despatches serving with Volunteer Companies and Engineer Detachments.
      Q. Nov. 19, 1353.

Wages
  Fair Wages Resolution, Infringement of—Woolwich Arsenal, Wages of Workmen in Dangerous Buildings.
    Q. Nov. 5, 139.

Wakefield and District Light Railways
  Order Presented, *Nov. 10*, 458; *Nov. 17*, 1097.

Waldie and Co., Messrs.
  Spirits distilled and sold by Indian Government, Analysis of.
    O. Mr. Caine, *Nov. 10*, 530.

Wales
  Carmarthen, *see* that title.
  Coal—Comparisons with New Zealand Coal as to bulk, Effectiveness in developing Steam, Price, &c.
    Q. Nov. 19, 1355.
  Postal Officials.
    Number appointed from English and Scottish Post Offices since 1st Jan., 1902.
      Q. Nov. 13, 870.
    Rule as to knowledge of the Welsh Language—Proportion of English to Welsh-speaking People in any Postal District.
      Q. Nov. 10, 462.
  Technical Instruction—Minute sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act of 1889, Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1345.

Walton, Mr. J. Lawson [Leeds, S.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 7*, 437.

Wanklyn, Mr. J. L. [Bradford, Central]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, Closure by Compartments, *Nov. 11*, 658, 662.

War Office
  Clerical Department—Rules as to employment of ex-Officers and Soldiers.
    Q. Nov. 12, 744.
  Indian Exchequer, Relations with.
    O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 486.
  South African War—Honours for Officials
    Q. Nov. 17, 1117.
  Works Department, Reorganisation of—Report of Departmental Committee.
    Q. Nov. 6, 265.

Warner, Mr. T. Courtenay [Stafford, Lichfield]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 170.

Water Provisional Order Bill
  c. con. Nov. 4*, 1.
    3R* *Nov. 5*, 129.
  l. 1R* *Nov. 10*, 449.
    2R* and 3R* *Nov. 17*, 1099.
    Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Water Supply
  Bagnalstown, Improvement in Water Supply.
    Q. Nov. 19, 1362.
  London—Population and Rateable Value of Boroughs, Statement Presented, *Nov. 6*, 258; *Nov. 17*, 1105.

Waterfield, Sir Henry.
  Services as Financial Adviser to the Secretary of State for India.
    O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Nov. 10*, 473.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
  Africa South—Loans to Boers in Money and in kind, Value placed on Oxen and Mules, *Nov. 4*, 6; *Nov. 6*, 266.

cont.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

- Guardafui, Cape, Erection of Lighthouse—Powers with whom Foreign Office had been in communication, *Nov. 11*, 586.
- India.
  - Budget—Opportunity for resuming Debate, *Nov. 11*, 602; *Nov. 18*, 1238.
  - Land—Cultivated and Waste Lands, Statistics, *Nov. 7*, 382; *Nov. 17*, 1111.
  - Rupees, Number coined in 1901-2—Amount of Gold Reserve Fund, *Nov. 7*, 383.
- North Sea Fisheries Investigation, International Scheme—Contributions of various countries, etc, *Nov. 4*, 8; *Nov. 5*, 135.
- Post Office Savings Bank Deposits—Total amount of Interest during 1899, Amount credited to Accounts having balance over £50, *Nov. 19*, 1347.
- Scotland.
  - Applecross — Construction of Road and Bridge, Refusal of the Congested Districts Board to provide Grant-in-aid, *Nov. 12*, 749,
  - Congested Districts, Population, Valuation, etc., Granting Return, *Nov. 4*, 11.
  - Crown Property—Income Tax Arrears, Steps taken to recover, *Nov. 14*, 1036.
  - Deer Forests.
    - Ben Wyvis, Converting Grazings on Southern Slope into Deer Forest, *Nov. 5*, 142.
    - Glastullich Farm, Adding to Rhidorroch Deer Forest, etc., *Nov.* 4, 10.
  - Fishery Board.
    - Appointment of Mr. Iloy as Member, Qualifications, *Nov. 12*, 751.
    - Cruisers placed at disposal of the Board during withdrawal of the "Jackal," *Nov. 5*, 143.
  - Harbour Grants-in-aid — Names of places for which Grants were refused, *Nov. 19*, 1347.
  - Larbert Railway Accident—Board of Trade Inquiry, *Nov. 13*, 872.
  - Lewis, Island of.
    - Buildings, Number of, erected under Bye-laws of the District Committee, *Nov. 6*, 259.
    - Destitution among Cottars and Fishermen, Acquisition of Land by Congested Districts Board, *Nov. 5*, 142, 143; *Nov. 17*, 1108.
    - Fisheries—Provision of Gunboat as protection against Trawlers, *Nov. 11*, 595; *Nov. 12*, 750.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

- Scotland—*cont.*
  - Lewis, Island of—*cont.*
    - Hospitals — Additional Accommodation for Infectious Diseases, *Nov. 11*, 594, 595; *Nov. 12*, 748, 749.
    - Local Government Board, Public Health Inquiry — Name of Inspecting Officer, etc., *Nov. 5*, 132; *Nov. 18*, 1234.
    - Ness.
      - Death from Typhus at — Insanitary Condition of House, etc., *Nov. 12*, 750.
      - Harbour of Port Ness, Condition of—Report, Selection of Engineer, *Nov. 17*, 1107; *Nov. 19*, 1348.
    - Poultry Breeding in—Number of Sittings of Eggs supplied by the Congested Districts Board, *Nov. 19*, 1348.
    - Social Condition of the People = Special Report of Crofters' Commission, *Nov. 18*, 1233.
    - Tolsta School, Number of Pupils, etc., *Nov. 13*, 874.
  - Road Construction in Mid-Ross — Insufficiency of Congested Districts Board Grant, *Nov. 12*, 748.
  - Stornoway.
    - Aird School Playground—Erection of Shelter for use in bad weather, *Nov. 18*, 1233.
    - Mail Service—Names and Ages of Steamers employed, etc., *Nov. 5*, 141; *Nov. 18*, 1235.
  - Trawling—Protection against illegal trawling, Additional Cruisers, *Nov. 4*, 11, 12.
- Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Number granted and Number refused, *Nov. 5*, 139.

Westland, Sir James

- Indian Salt Tax, Opinion as to increasing. *O.* Sir H. Fowler, *Nov. 10*, 495.

Wharton, Rt. Hon J. L. [York, W.R. Ripon]

- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 5*, 188; *Nov. 13*, 893, 933.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]

- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 12*, 821; *Nov. 14*, 1045; *Nov. 17*, 1209; *Nov. 18*, 1257, 1259, 1260.

White, Mr. Luke (York, E. R., Buckrose]

- Customs Boatmen Grievances—Inquiry, *Nov. 12*, 744.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill *com.*, *Nov. 12*, 761, 764; *Nov. 17*, 1193, 1194.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Agricultural Grant, Payment to each Parish by County Councils, *Nov. 18* 1228.

[*cont.*

White, Mr. Luke—*cont.*
Volunteer Officers serving in South Africa mentioned in Despatches — Number belonging to Companies and Engineer Detachments, *Nov. 19*, 1353.

Whiteley Mr. G. [York, W. R., Pudsey]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 5*, 184, 205; *Nov. 12*, 825; *Nov. 18*, 1277; *Nov. 19*, 1428, 1460.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 4*, 56; *Nov. 5*, 153, 164; *Nov. 6*, 286,, 289, 292; *Nov. 12*, 762, 774; *Nov. 13*, 956; *Nov. 14*, 1064, 1066; *Nov. 17*, 1175, 1222; *Nov. 18*, 1244, 1315; *Nov. 19*, 1378, 1428.
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Financial Resolution Report, *Nov. 17*, 1143,
Grant-in-aid Clause, Government Changes in, *Nov. 14*, 1037.

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* *Nov. 17*, 1099.
Royal Assent, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Williams, Col. R. [Dorset, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 6*, 308.

Williams, Lieut.-Col. A. B.
Woolwich Arsenal—Objections to Dual Appointment as Collector of Income and Paymaster to the Royal Arsenal.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 457.

Williams, Mr. O. [Merionethshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 18.*, 1249.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Allocation of Undenominational Endowments, *Nov. 11* 587.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid)
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 13*, 906.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [York, W. R., Holmfirth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 13*, 897.
Police.
Palace Yard Police—Regulations as to wearing Greatcoats, *Nov. 19*, 1358
Perjury, Case of Ex-Constable Rolls—Dismissal of Second Constable from the Force, *Nov. 4*, 7.

Wilson, Mr. J. [Durham, Mid.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 12*, 845. *Nov. 14*, 1053, 1062; *Nov. 18*, 1252, 1253.
Workhouse Nursing Staffs and Masters and Matrons, Difference between—Committee, Date of Report, *Nov. 4*, 9.

Wilson, Mr. J. [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
Army—Promotion of Mr. J. P. Spanton to rank of Veterinary Captain, Qualifications, *Nov. 14*, 1036.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 19*, 1453.

Winter Assizes
see Assizes.

Wolverton, Lord
Patent Law Amendment Bill, 2R., *Nov. 17*, 1099.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov, 5*, 188; *Nov. 6*, 283, 290, 291, 314, 359, 361, 367; *Nov. 13*, 907.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Audit of Municipal Accounts, Opportunity for consideration of Government Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1106.

Woolwich Arsenal
Wages of Workmen in Danger Buildings, Infringement of Fair Wages Resolution, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 5*, 139.
Williams, Lieut.-Col. A. B., holding dual position of Collector of Income Tax and Paymaster to the Royal Arsenal. Objections.
Q. *Nov. 10*, 457.

Workhouses
Nursing Staffs and Masters and Matrons, Differences between—Committee Date of Report.
Q. *Nov. 4*, 9.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. Stuart [Sheffield, Hallam]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 19*, 1446.

Wreckage
Donegal Coast, Removal of Wreckage.
Q. *Nov. 12*, 757.

Wright, Private
Reservist Pay Arrears.
Q. *Nov. 11*, 591.

Wylie, Mr. A. [Dumbartonshire]
India—Irrigation Works, Inquiry proposed—Economic Condition of India, Effect of Currency Changes, Results of Countervailing Duties on Sugar, etc., *Nov. 10*, 573.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G., *Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]
Bagnalstown Water Supply, Improvement in. *Nov. 19*, 1362.
Ballaghaderreen—Refusal of Transfer of Public Licence to Mr. James Casey, *Nov. 6*, 274.
Bankers [Ireland] Act Repeal Bill, 2R., *Nov. 5*, 255, 256.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
  Belfast.
    Borough Accounts—Non-publication of Auditors' Report, *Nov. 5*, 146, 147.
    Infirmary, Death of Child—Medical Officer refusing to grant Death Certificate, *Nov. 10*, 464.
    Revaluation—Names, Qualifications, etc., of Valuers. *Nov.* 19, 1363.
  Calderwood *v.* M'Curdy Case, Police Evidence — Proceedings under the Crimes [Ireland] Act proposed, *Nov. 6*, 277.
  Canadian Mail Service—Sligo as a Port of Call, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 753.
  Carrick-on-Shannon disused Prison, Handing over to Leitrim Agricultural and Technical Committee, *Nov. 11*, 599.
  Census—Delay in issue of Armagh and Antrim Returns, *Nov. 5*, 147.
  Constabulary, Royal Irish.
    Belfast—Number of Police Barracks, etc., *Nov. 13*, 879.
    Monaghan—Number of Constables doing Town Duty, Religious Denominations, etc., *Nov. 4*, 14.
    O'Donnell, J.—Refusal of Admission as Recruit, *Nov. 5*, 145.
    Thomastown Guardians' Complaints as to action of District Inspector Fleming, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
    Tyson's, District Inspector, alleged Speech denouncing Freemasonry, *Nov. 4*, 14.
  Courthouses.
    Maintenance of—Number of County Councils refusing to vote money, *Nov. 17*, 1128.
    Use by District Councils—Number of Refusals *Nov. 13*, 879, 880.
  Crimes Act of 1887, Prosecutions of Ladies under—Inquiry into Case of Imprisonment, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 755.
  Deaf and Dumb, Maintenance of, as an Imperial Charge, proposed, *Nov. 4*, 13.
  Dillon Estate—Advertisement of Mansion for sale, Private Offers declined, alleged, *Nov. 6*, 276.
  Dublin Custom House, Nuns begging Alms, alleged, *Nov. 4*, 13.
  Education — Dr. Starkie's Statements against Primary School Managers, Roman Catholic Managers' Resolutions, etc., *Nov. 5*, 148; *Nov. 12*, 752.
  Explosives, Pembroke Urban Council By-Laws — Local Government Board Sanction, *Nov. 10*, 466.
  Gara Lough Eel Fishery — Proprietor suffering Loss owing to Floods caused by Dillon Estate Drainage operations, alleged, *Nov. 11*, 597.
  Harrel, Sir D., Resignation of Office, Reasons for Acceptance, *Nov. 12*, 754.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
  Irish Language.
    Grant to Royal Irish Academy for copying Irish Manuscripts and production of Irish Dictionary—Transfer of to the Irish Texts Society proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1237.
    Inspectors—Appointment of Inspectors capable of examining Pupils in Irish, proposed, *Nov 17*, 1129.
    Instruction in—Regulations preventing Department of Agriculture from sanctioning Expenditure, alleged, *Nov. 13*, 879.
    Magistrates—Appointment of Magistrates having a knowledge of the Irish Language, *Nov. 18*, 1237.
  Irish National Parliamentary Party—Imprisonment of Members.
    Number in prison under Hard Labour Sentences, *Nov. 5*, 146.
    Permission to receive Parliamentary Papers, etc., Modification of Prison Rules, proposed, *Nov 19*, 1364.
  Labourers' Acts—Boyle No. 2 District Council, Delay in issue of Supplemental Loan, *Nov. 5*. 146.
  Labourers' Cottages, Roscrea Scheme—Selection of Sites by the District Council, *Nov. 12*, 751.
  Land Commission—Longford and Leitrim, Number of Fair Rent Applications, pending, etc., *Nov. 11*, 599.
  Land Purchase—Col. Finch's Coonagh Property, Sale to Tenants, *Nov. 4*, 12.
  Land Question.
    "Future Tenants" in County Leitrim, Number of—Safeguarding Interests, Deputation proposed, *Nov. 10*, 465.
    Legislation—Anticipatory Statement, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 754; *Nov. 17*, 1129.
  Limerick, Port of—Injury done to Trade by Congested Districts Board Subsidy to Clyde Company at Cork, *Nov. 12*, 753.
  Local Authorities, Contracts—Preference given to Members of the United Irish League, Action of the Government, *Nov. 6*, 275.
  Local Government Board.
    Auditors' Examinations, Rules as to Second Nomination, etc., *Nov. 11*, 598.
    Report, Want of Index, *Nov. 5*, 148.
  Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, Date of proceeding with, *Nov. 11*, 600.
  Longford—Mutoscopes, Nature of Pictures exhibited—Police Supervision proposed, *Nov. 12*, 752.
  Magistrates and Justices of the Peace.
    Macauley's, Mr. J., Disloyal Speech at Belfast—Government Action, *Nov. 13*, 881.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Magistrates—*cont.*
  - Roscrea, Appointment of Additional Justices, proposed, *Nov. 13*, 878.
- Malicious Injuries, Compensation for, Case of Mr R. Sproule, *Nov. 6*, 274.
- Marine Works (Ireland) Act—Allocation of Moneys voted, *Nov. 10*, 464.
- Medical Officers.
  - County Councillors, Disqualification of Poor Law Medical Officers, *Nov. 13*, 878.
  - Dispensary Medical Service.
    - Reform—Opinion of the President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, *Nov. 6*, 276.
    - Salaries of Medical Officers, Raising, *Nov. 11*, 599, 600.
- Middleton Guardians granting use of Board Room for Political Meetings—Precedent for Legal Proceedings by the Crown, *Nov. 10*, 463.
- Muldowney, Michael, Imprisonment for complicity in the Craughwell murder—Date of Release, *Nov. 18*, 1238.
- National School Teachers.
  - Drogheda — Head Teacher of St. Mary's School losing £50 a year owing to New Rules, *Nov. 5*, 147; *Nov. 13*, 879.
  - Salaries, Monthly Payment proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1127.
- Newbridge Artizans' Cottages—Board of Works refusing to issue final instalments of Loan, alleged, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
- Poor Law Children—Boards refusing permission to Lady Inspector to examine Boarded-out Children, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1128.
- Poor Law Officers' Superannuation, Limitation of Liability of Ratepayers—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 6*, 277.
- Poor Law Unions.
  - Amalgamation of Unions—Investigations, *Nov. 13*, 880.
  - Clerks—Transfer of Work under the Franchise of Jurors Acts to Clerks of Unions proposed, *Nov. 10*, 465, 466.
  - Londonderry and Donegal Union Boundaries, Change in—Date of Local Government Board Inquiry, *Nov. 13*, 877.
- Rating Appeals, Number of—Results of Appeals, *Nov. 19*, 1364.
- Shannon River, Construction of Bridge at Hatley—Terms of Loan from Public Works Commissioners, *Nov. 10*, 466.
- Tallow Conspiracy Case—Charge of Lord Chief Baron, Breach of Public Trust by Officials, alleged, *Nov. 17*, 1128; *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Tara, Hill of, Excavations, Preservation of Ancient Monuments, *Nov. 10*, 463.
- Tramways (Ireland) Acts, Amendment proposed — Publication of Report of Public Works Commissioners, *Nov. 11*, 598.
- Trawling in Dublin Bay—Destruction of line fishing, *Nov. 12*, 753.

Yang-tsze Valley
- British Influence in.
  Q. *Nov. 4*, 7.

Yeomanry, Imperial
- Cost—Average Annual Cost of an Imperial Yeoman.
  Q. *Nov. 7*, 385.
- South African War Medal—Battalions sent to South Africa in 1902, Granting Medal, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 19*, 1354.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester].
- Army Mobilisation—Government intention to keep Force mobilised and ready for embarkation, *Nov. 11*, 592, 593.
- South African War Medals.
  - Granting to Yeomanry Battalions sent to South Africa in 1902, *Nov. 19*, 1354.
  - Regulations, Effect on Auxilary Forces, *Nov. 19*, 1353.

York
- Sergeant Leonard writing to Secretary of State for War, Degradation to the Ranks,
  Q. *Nov. 17*, 1118.

Yorkshire
- Parliamentary By-Election—New Member Sworn for North Riding, *Nov. 7*, 381.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 4*, 58; *Nov. 5*, 171, 174, 180, 181; *Nov. 6*, 325; *Nov. 12*, 792; *Nov. 14*, 1060; *Nov. 19*, 1407.
- Jerusalem—British Residents' Complaints as to treatment by the Consulate, *Nov. 11*, 593.

Zanzibar.
- Import Duties — Convention between United Kingdom and the United States of America Presented, *Nov.13*, 857.
- Slavery, Case of Slave Girl Msichoke—British Agent's Report.
  Q. *Nov. 11*, 586.